2015

Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

Mary Ellen Brown
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

INVESTING IN THE CIVIC ECONOMY: SOCIAL CAPITAL AND CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

In

The School of Social Work

by
Mary Ellen Brown
B.S., Spring Hill College, 2000
M.S.W, University of South Carolina, 2004
M.P.A, Louisiana State University, 2011
August 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the Office of University Partnerships of the United States (US) Department of Housing and Urban Development for funding provided to support the research reported in this dissertation through the Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant program. The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Special thanks are extended to committee members Timothy Page (Chair), Priscilla Allen, Cecile Guin, and Michelle Livermore (Members), and Margaret-Mary Sulentic Dowell (Dean's Representative). In addition, the author acknowledges:

- Louisiana State University, and in particular the Office of Social Service Research and Development and the School of Social Work, for the facilities and services provided in support of this research project.
- The City of Shreveport, the Choice Neighborhood Leadership Team, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, and resident and community partners for their willingness to participate in and collaborate on this initiative.
- The US Department of Housing and Urban Development Choice Neighborhoods Initiative for providing a planning grant to the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments and the City of Shreveport, and subsequently opening the door for this opportunity.

Finally, the author expresses deep gratitude to her loving community, including her husband and partner Graham, parents Ellen and Wayne, and devoted companions Savannah, Charlotte and Raleigh. To my family, mentors, friends, neighbors, and colleagues, I am forever grateful for all of you on the balcony.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Concentrated poverty in inner-city neighborhoods in the United States generates social disorganization and isolation, limiting residents' access to opportunities for upward mobility. Place-based concentration effects can be detrimental to individual health outcomes and overall community health. Communities require assets and resources across multiple types of capital, and in particular social capital, in order to foster a thriving civic economy. The purpose of this research was to provide a foundation through the study of social capital for pursuing strategic actions to foster a thriving civic economy for residents in a low-wealth neighborhood in Shreveport, Louisiana, that was also the focus of a Choice Neighborhoods planning initiative.

A community-engaged research approach was used to examine relationships between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement, social capital, collaboration and openness to transformation in this mixed-methods study. This examination included cognitive and structured social capital constructs on the following five dimensions: trust, reciprocal relationships, social cohesion, social ties and civic engagement.

Results of this research suggest empowerment, collaboration and civic engagement are critical building blocks for trust, social capital and community transformation. Additionally, relative social class effects in low wealth communities may exist, whereas people with the fewest resources may be more likely to experience a sense of institutional disengagement and a higher degree of powerlessness, which should be further examined. Further, it is recommended that policymakers and practitioners continue to improve processes to develop social capital and build trust, foster collaborative conditions, and invest in strategies to facilitate meaningful resident engagement in community change efforts in order to build healthy communities.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In the United States (US) in 2013, 45.3 million Americans lived in poverty, nearly 15 million of which were children (US Census, 2014a; DeNavas-Walt & Proctor, 2014). Of those 15 million children, "almost half of American children who are born to parents on the bottom rung of the income ladder [will] remain at the bottom as adults" (Donovan, Duncan & Sebelius, 2012, p. 108). The zip code where Americans are born, grow, work, play and live has been found to be an illuminating predictor of lifelong health (Andrews & Retsinas, 2012), and has been considered a stronger indicator of life expectancy than individual genetic codes (Lavizzo-Mourey, 2012). Access to employment, education, and other resources is dictated largely by one's place of residence, and health outcomes have been directly connected to the physical environment where people live (Blackwell, 2012; Erickson, Galloway & Cytron, 2012). Understanding the effects of neighborhoods on health outcomes is particularly relevant when planning for policies and programs to support economic mobility for people living in poverty. The purpose of this research was to provide a foundation through the study of social capital for pursuing strategic actions to foster a thriving civic economy for residents in a low-wealth neighborhood that was also the focus of a Choice Neighborhoods planning initiative in Shreveport, Louisiana.

Scope of the Problem

Poverty areas are defined by the US Census as geographic tracts with an overall poverty rate of 20% or more (Bishaw, 2014; US Census, 2014b), and extreme-poverty neighborhoods refers to geographic areas where poverty is densely clustered, such that 40% or more of the individuals residing in the area are living below the poverty threshold (Gennetian, Ludwig, McDade & Sanbonmatsu, 2013; Kneebone, Nadeau, & Berube, 2011). Urban poverty has been

defined as concentrated disadvantage impacting communities in inner-city areas (Wilson, 1987; Wratten, 1995). Wilson (1987) described the need for comprehensive, creative and sustainable public policy solutions for urban communities experiencing the place-based concentration effects of poverty in his influential book, *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Wilson (1987) explained the effects of urban poverty and social isolation as complex and racially disproportionate, leading to social dislocation and economic deprivation and for an increasingly isolated urban underclass of Black Americans. The structural changes and economic decline of inner-city areas has led to neighborhood concentration effects and social disorganization, which can severely restrict life chances for economic mobility and overall community health (Curley, 2005; Wilson, 1987, 1997).

The concentration effects of urban poverty have received significant attention in recent decades, as place-based pervasive poverty has been associated with elevated rates of crime, unemployment, single female-headed households, economic disinvestment, physical deterioration, and the perpetuation of segregation (Berube, 2012; Curley, 2005; Donovan et al., 2012; Sampson & Morenoff, 1997; Wilson, 1987; von Hoffman, 2012). Over time, the economic landscape of the US has changed dramatically, perpetuating and intensifying structural inequities in urban communities. According to Wilson (1987), unskilled urban minorities were particularly vulnerable to the structural inequities associated with economic immobility because of the shifts in the country's economic structure in the 1960s. Employment opportunities and people moved away from urban centers, and a decrease in demand for lower-skilled workforce resulted from the drastic reduction in manufacturing labor jobs. As urban communities became disproportionately populated with low-skilled and low income ethnic and racial minorities, many

Black Americans in particular were left out of work and isolated in inner-city neighborhoods (Curley, 2005; Sampson, 2009; Wilson, 1987).

Wilson (1987) proposed that the characteristics of neighborhoods impact individuals, and for the underclass – the disadvantaged residents left behind in socially dislocated urban centers – concentrated poverty means disadvantageous individual outcomes. Wilson (1987) argued that social isolation is a characteristic of inner-city neighborhoods with highly concentrated poverty, and this impacts an individual's employment opportunities. Without the ability to find a job or sustain employment, economic mobility is nearly impossible to attain. Wilson's description of the neighborhood effects of concentrated poverty persists today (Curley, 2005), and the persistence of poverty is more difficult to escape for certain demographics (e.g. racial minorities, single female headed households) (Stevens, 1999). African Americans experience the highest rates of poverty of all groups – comprising an estimated 50% of all inner city poor in the country (Edelman, 2012) – and in 2010 from the effects of the Great Recession, poverty reached its highest peak since 1993 (Berube, 2012; Miller, 2012; von Hoffman, 2012). Addressing the problem and consequences of poverty requires neighborhood-level solutions (Franklin & Edwards, 2012). Mendenhall, DeLuca and Duncan (2006), asserted that affluence, educational status and the spatial availability of jobs were influential predictors of economic mobility. Further, the use of social networks has been found to account for up to 50% of job attainment (Mouw, 2002, p. 512), and social capital is an important resource for this process.

Since the 1960s, the US Census Bureau has calculated the official measure of poverty as individual and household level income in relation to a poverty threshold (Berube, 2012), and "more Americans experience poverty today than at any time in the 53 years the Census Bureau has published such figures" (Miller, 2012, p. 227; Tavernise, 2011). While poverty and income

are critical considerations for health and life opportunity, upward mobility requires more than growth in economic capital. Economic mobility requires gains in financial, human and social capital currencies (Reim, 2013). In a thriving civic economy, there exists a high degree of public, social, human, financial and physical capital, that collectively support the people in their community environment. The concept of the civic economy, also referred to as the civic-societal economy, includes the market economy within its realm and is grounded in the economy of nature, but is additionally concerned with human interests and the values of society (Plater, 1999). In the civic economy, individuals and organizations contribute by investing in the public good. Government, private, philanthropic, educational and nonprofit entities along with individual citizens work collectively to build prosperous and sustainable communities (Morrison, 2013). Public officials and cross-sector partners align investments and resources to advance social and economic goals (Thompson, 2011). A thriving civic economy is characterized by access to opportunities for quality education, effective social policies, jobs with live-able wages, functional social and cross-organizational networks, and promotes public safety, health, well-being and a high quality of life through the development of financial, human and social capital.

According to Putnam (2000a), social capital is a concept that describes the connections, relationships and trust that exist among individuals and within communities, and is essential to civic vitality. Financial, human and social capital are each considered assets with the potential for a return on investment, and social capital is an asset that can benefit both individuals and communities (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Lin, 2008; Putnam, 2000a). Social capital is considered essential to attaining upward mobility (Putnam, 2000a; Reim, 2013). Social capital at an individual level can be defined as the investments in relationships for access and resources that lead to gains in individual outcomes (Lin, 2008; Putnam, 2000a). Adler and Kwon (2002) define

social capital at its core as a "valuable resource" that is related to the "goodwill that others have toward us" (p. 18).

For communities, social capital is the collective strength and quality of relationships within a group of people (*bonding*) and with those outside the community group (*bridging*), social norms, trust, and access to decision making and resources (Banks & Butcher, 2013; Putnam, 2000a). Addressing the problem of pervasive poverty requires economic and human capital solutions (von Hoffman, 2012), as well as gains in social capital, as mobilizing social capital can lead to economic gains (Midgley & Livermore, 1998). Disinvested, distressed communities with a declining civic economy are often lacking in numerous forms of capital, which serves as an impediment to economic mobility. Putnam (2002a) maintained that social capital is not equally distributed, which can be a concern in communities with concentrated poverty, as those persons who need social capital the most are often those who have the least.

For individuals lacking in social capital, socially isolated neighborhoods of highly concentrated poverty present an especially difficult barrier to overcome in accessing employment and educational opportunities (Greenbaum, Hathaway, Rodriguez, Spalding & Ward, 2008). Keels (2008) cited neighborhood placement itself (the quality of a neighborhood) as having the potential for impacting individual economic outcomes. Sampson (2009) created a measure of social factors that can be considered predictors to structural inequities in neighborhoods, which include: welfare recipients; poverty; unemployment level; female-headed households; percentage of minority population; and the ratio of children to population. Greenbaum et al. (2008) contended that racism, the lack of quality educational and employment opportunities, health disparities, and other societal barriers are predictors of poverty that also perpetuate structural inequities. Mentoring from interaction and affiliation with neighbors of a higher social class has

been recognized as another important predictor of economic mobility, a resource that poverty-dense, urban neighborhood residents typically lack (Curley, 2005; Greenbaum et al., 2008; Putnam, 2000a; Wilson, 1987).

Policy measures at state and national levels to reduce segregation and isolation and promote economic mobility are necessary in order to address the structural inequities that perpetuate the generational poverty cycle of urban communities that continues to oppress disadvantaged individuals and families. Historically, federal programs to address poverty have operated in silos, concentrating funding streams, policies and resources on specific outcome areas such as health, education, public safety, housing, rather than neighborhood-health and specific neighborhood needs (Franklin & Edwards, 2012). The field of community development is concerned with antipoverty approaches in geographic places where poverty is concentrated (Berube, 2012; Hecht, 2012). The most successful antipoverty initiatives are believed to integrate both place-based and people-based interventions (Belsky & Fauth, 2012; Donovan et al., 2012; Erickson, Galloway, & Cytron, 2012). Place-based strategies are holistic antipoverty neighborhood approaches that link place- and people-based strategies to improve residents' quality of life while effecting environmental improvements (Schriver, 2004).

To effectively combat poverty, government policies and interventions should be "geographic, holistic, and specific to the unique set of assets and deficits that exist within neighborhoods" (Franklin & Edwards, 2012, p.171). More recently, President Obama's administration introduced the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative in 2010, tasking federal agencies with developing place-based policy strategies to transform neighborhoods of concentrated poverty into healthier communities (White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative [WHNRI], 2011). The White House Initiative's place-based strategies

are intended to provide accessibility to quality education, services, and employment opportunities, while simultaneously building neighborhood capacity, stimulating economic growth, and improving the overall well-being of community members (WHNRI, 2011).

Choice Neighborhoods is one of the primary federal approaches to comprehensive neighborhood transformation resulting from the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative, delivered through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), initiated in 2010, and building on the HOPE VI housing revitalization program (Donovan et al., 2012). This place-based initiative focuses on comprehensive community planning with an emphasis on resident participation built on the premise that in order to successfully transform impoverished neighborhoods, public housing residents must be empowered by providing accessibility to community assets and resources, including quality healthcare and education, healthy food options, transportation, and enriched economic opportunity (Fudge, 2011).

In March of 2011, the City of Shreveport, Louisiana received a Choice Neighborhood Planning grant from HUD to transform the economically depressed neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights – sister communities once connected by the public housing property of Naomi Jackson Heights, which was demolished in 2006. These disinvested communities have been marked by high rates of property abandonment, resultant urban decay, excessive crime, high unemployment, low educational attainment and extreme poverty in recent decades (Brown, 2011). The inner city neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights are situated immediately west of the central business district, and have been considered to be deep poverty communities, with nearly 45% of households in the neighborhoods living below the poverty line (US Census, 2013). The US Department of Agriculture (2015) classified the area as a low income and low access food desert, and with only one library in the area serving over 5,000

residents (US Census, 2013) the area has also been considered a literacy desert. With over an 150-year history, Allendale is the site of the home of the first Black lieutenant governor of Louisiana, C.C. Antoine, and Ledbetter Heights is "listed as a historic district for its role as an African American entertainment, music and commercial center in the 1940s and 1950s" (City of Shreveport, 2013, p.5). The Municipal Auditorium music venue, which hosted the Louisiana Hayride, and musicians including Elvis Presley and Hank Williams, Sr., is a historic landmark in Ledbetter Heights (City of Shreveport, 2013).

As of receipt of the Choice Neighborhood planning award, this once vibrant community was in a state of devastating decline. In 2011, this high stress urban community embodied many characteristics of concentrated disadvantage, including a predominantly minority population living in deep poverty, with job security and food security concerns, limited literacy and educational achievement, and high rates of resident mobility in a physical landscape with numerous vacant lots and blighted properties. Ninety-three percent of residents in the neighborhood were Black or African American (US Census, 2013). With the neighborhood unemployment rate at 14% (HUD, 2013), and 10% of residents having earned an associate's degree or higher (US Census, 2013), job readiness and access to livable wage jobs was a primary community concern. Renters occupied approximately 60% of the households in the Shreveport Choice Neighborhoods planning area in 2010, and blighted and abandoned properties remained a problem for this community, with adjudicated properties accounting for 25% of all properties in the area (HUD, 2013). Nearly half of the property lots in the 2.7 square-mile radius of these historic and once vibrant neighborhoods remained vacant in 2013. In 1980, the population of Allendale neighborhood was approximately 16,000, and in 2013 this number was closer to 5,000 (US Census, 2013). Over time, a lack of investment coupled with concentrated poverty, high

crime, low educational attainment and high unemployment have become characteristic of the degree of distress in this once vital community.

Leaders of this place-based initiative were tasked from 2011 to 2013 to devise a holistic plan to address physical, educational, workforce, social and healthcare neighborhood components. Revitalized housing through an infill strategy is a core element of this HUD-funded place-based initiative, with the intention of creating a mixed-income, multifamily, sustainable neighborhood.

Figure 1. Map of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood (Source: Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, 2012)

The City of Shreveport's Office of Community Development and the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments led the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative, in partnership with the Shreveport Housing Authority. Other key partners include the Community Foundation of Northwest Louisiana, the Consortium for Education, Research and Technology, Volunteers of America of North Louisiana, the Caddo Parish Public School system,

and the Shreveport Regional Arts Council. A Neighborhood Steering committee comprised of residents and leadership in the neighborhood guided planning efforts, and was tasked with building capacity and engaging and cultivating local leadership.

The literature regarding the mobilization and organization of the members of a community in a neighborhood revitalization initiative is clear: residents must be authentically engaged in order for a transformation to be successful and sustainable (Ahsan, 2008; Pyles, 2009). Scholars and practitioners largely agree that neighbor involvement is an essential key to success in launching a maintainable neighborhood revitalization initiative, and, therefore, that resident engagement should be an integral part of the early stages of planning formulation (Chaskin, 2001; Fudge, 2011; Hyman, 2002; Kingsley, McNeely, & Gibson, 1997). However, understanding how to engage residents in a meaningful way is equally critical. The Choice Neighborhood concept relies on the interest of persons outside of the neighborhood to invest in commercial ventures in and around the community, and for persons to assess the revitalized neighborhood as a desirable place to live for themselves and their families, to achieve the in-fill, mixed-income approach. In addition, residents must see the revitalized neighborhood as a desirable place to live for themselves and their families. These two factors – outside investors and engaged, committed residents – are believed to be able to generate the in-fill development and mixed-income economy that a balanced, sustainable neighborhood requires (Morrison, 2011).

Increasing the desirability of the neighborhood, perceived quality of life, and therefore its market economy, requires an understanding and strengthening of the neighborhood's civic economy first – its social capital, level of neighbor engagement and trust. An environment of trust is an essential element to fostering a community of prosperity and thriving civic economy,

and trust is a key factor in establishing social capital (Usher, 2007). Factors that have been found to affect neighborhood mobilization include "feelings of empowerment, sense of community" and "positive neighboring relations" and residents most likely to engage in collective action in low-income neighborhoods share a sense of common good (Bolland & McCallum, 2002, p. 46). Common good is associated with cultural values and attitudes that promote trust, understanding and empathy. Sustainable neighborhood revitalization for people living in an impoverished community marked by concentrated and chronic disinvestment cannot take place if there is a lack of trust between residents within the neighborhood and those outside of the neighborhood with access to resources, power and influence over policy to invest in transformation (Geller, Doykos, Craven, Bess, & Nation, 2014). The civic economy is rooted in community collaboration, recognizes the expertise of the local community, values reciprocity and mutual self-interest, and capitalizes on local assets including physical resources and social networks (Thompson, 2011).

Mobilizing and organizing residents around shared interests can facilitate increased levels of participation in community development initiatives (Bolland & McCallum, 2002). Understanding how to engage residents in a meaningful way is critical to neighborhood revitalization success and sustainability (Karpman, 2013). Empowerment is a fundamental technique in successful and sustainable organizing initiatives (Rich, Edlestein, Hallman, & Wandersman, 1995). Pyles (2009) defines empowerment as an "idea that seeks to develop individual power in order to reshape the environment, a belief that people are capable of making their own choices and have much to offer in shaping society" (p. 11). Further, Pyles (2009) described empowerment as a mutually reinforcing concept of social change, and posits that the more empowered residents are in the process of affecting change, the more sustainable the organizing initiative will be. Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation is a useful tool that

provides guidance for cultivating meaningful resident participation and promoting empowerment strategies (Arnstein, 1969; Pyles, 2009).

At the lower levels of *manipulation* and the misuse of *psychotherapy*, participation is non-existent or low; at the midlevel rungs of the ladder of informing, consultation and placation, participation is regarded as tokenism; and as a neighborhood revitalization effort moves residents up the higher three levels of partnership, delegated power, and citizen control (with citizen control at the top), authentic citizen power and empowerment become possible (Arnstein, 1969; Pyles, 2009). On the bottom rung, Arnstein (1969) explains that manipulation occurs when those with power form citizen advisory committees and invite residents to participate, but rather than have any power in decision-making or a voice in the planning process, it is the function of those in power to educate or garner support from the participants. Arnstein uses the term therapy to denote the misuse of psychiatry to "cure" a participant of a "pathology," rather than to address an unjust systemic issue (racism, victimization), having citizens "adjust their values and attitudes to those of the larger society" (p. 219), rather than address the issue of social injustice. The *informing* rung is considered an important initial step toward authentic participation, but there is typically a one-way flow of information and little participant power at this level; *consultation* is another important step, but if nothing is done with the information that is acquired through consultation then this step alone holds no meaning; and *placation* is when a degree of power is shared with a few citizens, but these citizens are hand-selected by the persons in power and remain a minority voice (Arnstein, 1969). In the upper rungs of *partnership* and *delegated power*, power begins to get authentically redistributed and planning and decision-making is shared, with citizens taking over majority authority at the delegated power level. At the top rung, *citizen control*, the citizens are fully in charge with full authority, and are in control of the

organization or program, with the ability to negotiate relationships and conditions with outsiders on their own terms (Arnstein, 1969).

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's guide to *Authentic Demand* (Ahsan, 2008) described the key to successful neighborhood initiatives as whether residents believe that better outcomes for themselves and their families are possible and whether they are dedicated to engaging in the pursuit of those beliefs. If residents are not engaged in a meaningful manner and in leadership roles in the pursuit of their own betterment, revitalization efforts will not succeed (Ahsan, 2008; Dreier, 1996). Techniques to mobilize residents in organizing efforts include leadership development, building capacity and social capital, empowerment, and promoting civic participation and engagement of residents (Brueggemann, 2014; Cnann & Rothman, 2008; Ohmer & Demasi, 2009). Organizers can offer leadership training and education for residents in strategic planning and political engagement and advocacy, cultivate open and reciprocal relationships and communication to build social networks, connect residents to resources and supports, and promote civic engagement which encourages residents to use their voices in advocating for issues and electing representative leadership (Ahsan, 2008).

Much as empowering individuals and cultivating social capital are key strategies to promoting successful, sustainable social and community-level change, disenfranchisement and social isolation are key factors in ensuring social stagnation. Wilson's (1987) theoretical concept of social isolation is the perpetuation of cyclical poverty in the urban underclass. The relevance of this theoretical construct is reflected in the challenge of addressing the social isolation patterns that are commonly associated with blighted, low-income urban neighborhoods. It is necessary to change these patterns of social isolation to patterns of social capital and empowerment in order to combat concentrated poverty and nurture neighborhoods of choice and opportunity (Aiyer,

Zimmerman, Morrel-Samuels, & Reischl, 2015). Historical factors that have contributed to social isolation are the unsuccessful history of public housing programs and policies and the absence of residential involvement in planning for public housing. According to Dreier (1996) "symptoms of urban decay – poverty, unemployment, homelessness, violent crime, racial segregation, and high infant mortality rates – have their roots in large-scale economic forces and Federal Government policy" (p.124).

Only in the past few decades has the federal government begun to embrace community empowerment as a strategy for revitalization in urban neighborhoods (Dreier, 1996). HUD has acknowledged the role it has played in exacerbating the plight of the urban underclass, and has stated that HUD produced "failed policies [that] had contributed to concentrations of poor families in inner-city neighborhoods" (US Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD], 1995, p. 1; Van Vliet, 1997). Despite these widespread failures of policy, Van Vliet (1997) documented a series of successful redevelopment initiatives, and stressed the comprehensive approach each effort used that contributed to those successes. None of the success stories focused on changing housing alone, but rather, all of the examples incorporated a comprehensive approach to redevelopment, which included strategies such as collaborative decision making, social services, educational programs, job training and creation, economic development, and crime reduction in coordination with housing rehabilitation and construction. These successful community-based approaches to affordable housing developments were recognized for their emphasis on meaningful resident participation (Van Vliet, 1997). The overall purpose of the Choice Neighborhood program is consistent with more recent efforts, which have focused on broader, more comprehensive and collaborative approaches to urban development.

Contribution and Relevance to Social Work

The social work profession is unique in its role of providing competent community-based practice methods because it is guided by both theory and standards of professional ethics and values (Hardcastle, Wenocur, & Powers, 1997). The social work field arose as the advocating voice for the most disadvantaged and oppressed persons in society (Sosin & Caulum, 1983) with a primary purpose of improving social conditions for those persons (Crean & Baskerville, 2007; Ochoa, 2004), and ameliorating poverty and injustice (Dean, 1977). Since the inception of the profession, vulnerable and oppressed populations have been the target of social work services, and this tradition was upheld in the 1980's by formal documents issued by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) and the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the two main governing bodies of the social work profession (Land, 1987). The field of social work continues this tradition today as it strives to challenge social injustices, and to empower and advocate for vulnerable populations through direct practice and systems level changes (Hoefer, 2000; NASW, 2008; Scanlon, Hartnett & Harding, 2006).

Social work is unique in that the mission not only calls for service to persons in need, but also to the betterment of social conditions for those persons (Land, 1987). This primary commitment to social justice and the resulting core values of social worker as advocate and change agent, are what distinguish social work from other helping professions (Bisman, 2004; Davis, 1988; Ehrenreich, 1985; Sosin & Caulum, 1983). Dean (1977) asserts that in order to help those who are unable to function in society, the most important charge for social workers is to identify the social factors responsible and to change the social systems, programs and policies accordingly. Historically, the profession has strived to promote social justice, advancing human development and the individual right to self-determination, and to minimize social conditions

which present barriers to this cause (Abramovitz, 1993; Ehrenreich, 1985). Social workers are called to be change agents: advocates who educate and empower through policy change, organizational change and community change in order to ameliorate social problems (Davis, 1988; Schneider & Netting, 1999; Specht & Courtney, 1994). Although context and culture influences the practice of social in different settings, shared values of the profession have been described as humanitarian values that promote "common social interest" (Bisman, 2004; Flexner, 2001, p. 157). Ethical social work practice has been conceptualized as promoting social justice and social welfare for individuals in need (Bisman, 2004). The values and ethics of the social work profession are interconnected concepts.

Social work values and ethics are integrated into neighborhood revitalization in the same way they are integrated into other roles in the field of social work: they are principles to be upheld in every practice situation. Social work is concerned with building connections and relationships: identifying issues, creating solutions and bringing together those in need with the resources to incite empowerment and sustainable change (DuBois & Miley, 2005). Because of the far-reaching, extensive mission of social work, professionals in the field have permeated into many important sectors of society that impact neighborhood revitalization, including community organizing and community development, mental health, healthcare, government, and education (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007).

Macro social work practice dates back to the settlement house movement and is concerned with affecting social change for vulnerable persons through impacting communities, organizations and policies (Austin, Coombs, & Barr, 2005; Vodde & Gallant, 2002). Macro social work is defined as addressing social problems on neighborhood and community-wide levels through advocacy and policy, community planning and organizing, and organizational and

program management (Austin et al., 2005). Grounded in an empowerment orientation, action-social model and strengths/capacity approach, macro social work roles in neighborhood revitalization initiatives include community organizer, community developer, community planner, social work administrator, evaluator, educator or consultant, and social policy advocate (Brueggemann, 2014). The most successful revitalization efforts require competent social work practice at all levels of intervention – this is the scenario that results in the greatest opportunity for empowerment and the promotion of sustainable social welfare for the advancement of neighborhoods and individuals and families within those neighborhoods.

Since 1898, with the founding of the profession of social work, practitioners have been called to be agents of change and to influence social policy as an essential part of the mission of the field (Domanski, as cited in Schneider & Netting, 1999; Schriver, 2004). Advocacy and social reform are central tasks of the social work professional, and have historically been regarded as core practice skills (Crean & Baskerville, 2007; Davis, 1988; Sosin & Caulum, 1983; Walz & Groze, 1991). The role of social worker as change agent and advocate is critical to effective work with communities because advocacy is an avenue for social workers to address and challenge inhumane conditions on both individual and systemic levels and promote the cause of their clients (Hardcastle et al., 1997). Advocacy is a means for social workers to engage people and empower neighborhoods and communities as forces for change to address a collective problem (Brueggemann, 2014). Advocacy is recognized as one of the three central roles of community organizers, as a function of organizing people around actions and strategies to improve conditions and increase power for marginalized groups of people to counteract social problems, and as such, is a critical role of effective community organizing work (Perlman & Gurin, 1972). Social workers can employ community organizing techniques to create, foster and

strengthen social capital and facilitate cross-sector collaboration, in order to generate economic development and improve standards of living for low-wealth communities (Midgley & Livermore, 1998). Rothman (2008) described capacity-centered development, originally termed locality development, as a method for community building which focuses on empowerment, social cohesion, engagement and participation, and leadership development.

This research is important to social work as it relates to key traditions and values of the field. These values include empowering individuals, advancing impoverished and marginalized communities, and advocating for policies and programs in order to improve the health and life outcomes for individuals and families. It informs the field of social work by exploring social capital and social welfare in community practice.

Contribution to Community Development

Although the individual components of social capital and social networks have been studied in depth, to date, limited research exists to understand how social capital and systems of trust within low-income communities impact residents' openness to neighborhood revitalization efforts. Social capital has been found as related to readiness for change (Usher, 2007) as well as to perceptions of health and well being for neighborhood residents (Cramm, van Dijk, & Nieboer, 2013; Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Yip et al., 2007; Usher, 2007). Understanding effective and meaningful resident engagement practice is critical to neighborhood revitalization success and sustainability. There is a gap in the literature in understanding the relationship between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital.

As the Choice planning process emphasizes meaningful resident engagement, it is important to understand the ways in which engagement is meaningful to residents, and specifically whether engagement impacts residents' social capital and therefore capacity for

change. In addition, we know little about creating a disciplined, simple process for building social capital for individuals living in urban neighborhoods marked by poverty. This research is important because it contributes to the knowledge base of community organizers and urban planners in their ability to meaningfully engage and empower citizens in community transformation initiatives. A greater understanding of the perceived civic economy and social trust systems of residents in blighted neighborhoods will assist planners and organizers in developing strategies to address revitalization efforts in significant and sustainable ways. This research provides a foundation for pursuing strategic actions to foster a thriving civic economy. This research examined the impact of the Choice planning process on dimensions of social capital. Though this research primarily informed the strategic planning efforts for the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights Choice Neighborhood, the broader impact is its contribution to a greater understanding of the influence of resident engagement in the planning process on social capital. This research thus hopes to provide useful insights for future neighborhood revitalization planning purposes.

This research has direct relevancy for the planning and implementation efforts of Shreveport's Choice Neighborhood initiative, and will promote knowledge sharing among relevant networks. The impact is important for the field of social work, and related fields as well, as it will help inform community organizers, planners, administrators, government officials, and others of the importance and relevance of the development of the civic economy as a foundation for improving housing and quality of life opportunities for persons in need. This research is responsive to HUD's Strategic Goals, as its outcomes will potentially impact future federal problem solving and policymaking in regards to neighborhood revitalization and residential engagement in the planning process. Understanding the potential impact of resident engagement

in revitalization planning on social capital, HUD partners will better recognize how to plan for improving the quality of life for residents, and how to build sustainable and inclusive communities, through building local capacity.

Purpose of the Study

This exploratory research examined the relationships between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital, and the connections of these relationships to openness to transformation. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of trust among residents affected by the Choice Neighborhoods Planning initiative in the neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights, in Shreveport, Louisiana. The objectives of this study aimed to understand the civic economy of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood, including an understanding of the perceived social capital: trust, reciprocal relationships, neighborhood cohesion and civic engagement of neighborhood residents.

Research Questions

Recognizing the need to understand the relationship between a neighborhood revitalization planning process, resident engagement and social capital, and the impact of those relationships on residents' readiness for the transformation of their community into a neighborhood of Choice, the following research questions were designed:

Q1: What are the residents' perceptions of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?

Q2: Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as marital status, age group, educational level, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?

Q3: Are residents' perceptions of social capital and trust related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?

Q4: Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they could contribute to improve their civic economy?

Q5: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents? [To what extent do residents report relatively higher levels of social capital one year after the initiation of the Choice Neighborhood planning process?]

Q6: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?

Summary

Chapter one presented the scope of the problem of concentrated poverty in the US and its relevancy to community health, the importance of this issue for social work and community development, and the purpose of this study. Chapter two presents a review of the literature on community organizing, engagement, a brief history of public housing policy in the US, as well as theoretical frameworks, and a review of studies pertinent to this research. In chapter three, the study methods are described. In chapter four, data analysis and findings are explicated, and chapter five contains discussion and recommendations based on this research.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The following literature review was conducted in order to gain an understanding of previous efforts to study community development, planning and housing policy as these relate to resident engagement, social capital, and resident trust. Community organizing, community development, and community engagement are discussed. A history of the evolution of housing policy is explored. The theoretical frameworks of ecological systems theory and social capital are reviewed. Relevant studies pertaining to social capital, trust, and neighborhood transformation are discussed.

Community Organizing

Community organizing aims to mobilize oppressed, marginalized groups of persons to act on their own behalf to enact change in order to achieve a common goal (Brueggemann, 2014); a key component of this directive is to build mutually supportive neighborhoods and community structures (Pyles, 2009). Neighborhood organizers may work to transform multiple oppressions, such as poverty, racism, and sexism, or may focus on combatting specific social injustice issues (Bruegemann, 2014; Ohmer & Demasi, 2009; Pyles, 2009). Empowerment and change orientation are the two key elements in progressive community organizing efforts. The empowerment perspective maintains that when people are fully engaged in a meaningful manner in a social change process, the likelihood of attaining and sustaining the desired changes is heightened (Pyles, 2009; Zimmerman, 2000).

In neighborhood revitalization efforts, the role of the community organizer is one of responsiveness to the neighborhood efforts, seeking to promote their agenda, and not one's own (Brueggemann, 2014). The community organizer's leadership style must be adaptive to fit the

needs of the situational context with respect to the readiness of the residents, with the objective of empowering leadership from within the community and gradually transferring leadership and responsibility to residents, as the goal of the community organizer is to work oneself out of a job (Alinsky, 1971; Brueggemann, 2014; Pyles, 2009). Specific roles of community organizers in neighborhood revitalization efforts include social work policy planners, social action advocates, and community developers (Cox, Erlich, Rothman & Tropman, 1974; Perlman & Gurin, 1972; Pilisuk, McAllister & Rothman, 1996; Pyles, 2009; Rothman & Tropman, 1987). Community developers, according to Rothman (2001), are concerned with locality development with the goals of enhancing the well-being of neighborhood residents. Community developers engage in the empowerment tradition of social work, by developing community capacity and cultivating local leadership to deal with neighborhood and systems problems (Pyles, 2009). Social planning is a strategy for focusing on public policies and program-related issues of social welfare and well-being. Social action advocates address issues of reallocation of power and power cultivation, and promote accessibility to resources for neighborhood residents (Pyles, 2009). According to Hillman and Seever (1968) traditional elements of community organizing include: (1) providing social and psychological benefits to persons in need; (2) providing self-help and mutual aid; (3) increasing the effectiveness of service delivery; and (4) achieving institutional level change. Progressive tools for community organizing include organizing constituencies and building coalitions, empowering organizations, and capacity-building methods (Pyles, 2009).

In the late 1800's, Charity Organization Societies emerged in the US (Cox, Erlich, Rothman & Tropman, 1974). Richmond led the Charity Organization Society movement, which focused its activities on providing services to meet the basic needs of individuals and families, otherwise known as casework (Greene, 2005). To improve individual functioning in society,

charity workers, also known as friendly visitors, worked to influence the nature of individuals' perceptions and emotions (Wakefield, 1992). Friendly visitors were concerned with pathology and psychological treatment of persons in need, and promoted individual adjustment to unjust social conditions (Trattner, 1999). Charity organization societies often focused on providing aid to those they deemed were the deserving poor – persons whose circumstances were not a fault of their own – and were skeptical about the ability of the government to effectively provide public aid to this marginalized sector of the population (Hansan, 2013). Charitable organization societies contributed significantly to the field of community organization through the establishment of welfare planning organizations, the coordination of charitable organizations, and for the development of social survey techniques (Cox, Erlich, Rothman & Tropman, 1974).

Another early pioneer of community organizing in social work is Addams. The settlement house movement during the Progressive Era, led by Addams, focused on effecting social change at the community level in urban communities (Brueggemann, 2014; Greene, 2005; Trattner, 1999), and settlement house workers were the profession's first social change agents (Ritter, 2007; Van Wormer, 2002). The practice of classifying persons living in poverty as undeserving views the disadvantaged individual as responsible for their circumstances (Katz, 2013), and in this way the Settlement House movement differed considerably from the Charitable Organization Societies. The Settlement House movement regarded poverty as a multidimensional, complex issue that was directly influenced by environmental conditions, and therefore required solutions at the community level (Marx, 2011).

Addams spent the majority of her life working with impoverished families advocating for social and economic rights (Steen, 2006). Settlement house workers followed her example and lived in the urban communities where they worked, alongside the people they served, in order to

improve social conditions (Huff, 2002; Trattner, 1999; Van Wormer, 2002). Social reform and social policy change activities were their primary functions as social workers (Steen, 2006; Trattner, 1999), which led to the modern-day empowerment tradition of the field (Van Wormer, 2002). The efforts of the settlement house workers also led to the development of the person-in-environment perspective (Austin, Coombs & Barr, 2005). The person-in-environment perspective provides the framework for understanding problems of individuals within the context of their communities and society, and persists as a tenet of social work practice today (Austin, Coombs & Barr, 2005).

Settlement house workers focused on addressing the causes of poverty and advocating for the improvement of social conditions. Alinsky's conflict organizing model of the 1930's shares fundamental values with this movement: whereas settlement house workers lived side by side with the persons they aimed to empower in the neighborhoods within which they lived, Alinsky asserted that organizers should stand in solidarity with people, rather than acting on behalf of them, in order to effect lasting, sustainable social change (Alinsky, 1971; Pyles, 2009). Alinsky is credited as being "America's best known community organizer," and his strategy of conflict organizing remains influential today (Brueggemann, 2014, p. 205). Alinsky's urban community organizing work began with the Back of the Yards Chicago neighborhood movement (Alinsky, 1941), which succeeded in applying union organizer tactics to gain political power for low-income residents resulting in responsiveness from local government in order to provide social services and programs to meet their needs (von Hoffman, 2012). This included the establishment of a baby clinic, job fairs, and hot lunch programs. Alinsky's conflict organizing strategy is framed on the belief that disenfranchised persons suffer from "organized apathy," and consider themselves as helpless in taking action to impact change in order to improve their own

conditions (Brueggemann, 2014, p.206). Based on this assumption, Alinsky promoted tactics to challenge this apathy by rousing conflict and discontent in community residents. This model identifies local leadership, develops block clubs, committees and community-wide organizations, and develops strategies and action-oriented tactics to enact change (Alinsky, 1971; Brueggemann, 2014).

During the civil rights labors of the 1950's and 1960's, the movement and development of grassroots community organizations for minority populations exploded. Foundations and the federal government began providing funding for initiatives that promoted neighborhood based services and the civic engagement of marginalized populations, through President Johnson's Great Society programs such as the Community Action Programs in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Community Action Agencies were established at the local level to oversee neighborhood community action programs, and the composition of their boards mandated engagement of low-income representation (Brueggemann, 2014). Chavez developed the organizational linking model through his work with migrant farm laborers in California, and this method involves cultivating trust, a sense of community, attachment and commitment through providing community structure by the way of community associations (Brueggemann, 2014; Pawel, 2014). This model works well when there are few organizing associations and a low sense of community cohesion, and focuses on building trust, social cohesion and commitment. Ross established the Ross House Meeting Model, which works well in communities where there is a lack of structure but high levels of commitment and social cohesion, where small groups of social circles get together to address a specific issue, building leadership, confidence and an infrastructure to empower the people to address the issue (Brueggemann, 2014; Schultz & Sandy, 2011).

In the 1970's and 1980's, the National People's Action was formed, an advocacy membership association led by Cincotta and Trapp, which was the first of many national neighborhood support networks and training centers to emerge promoting grassroots leadership and advocacy to influence legislation (Brueggemann, 2014; National People's Action, 2015). Kahn, a pivotal social work community organizer, established the Direct Action and Research Training center and Grassroots Leadership during this time (Brueggemann, 2014; Kahn, 2001). Community organizing has evolved into a field where community development and organization must be pursued as an interconnected effort (Brueggemann, 2014). Modern community organization strategies incorporate many elements of early organizing models, for example, the persisting goals of strengthening community participation, enhancing coping capacities, improving social conditions and services and advancing the interests of disadvantaged groups (Perlman & Gurin, 1972). However, modern organizing practices place greater emphasis on the flexibility of the usage of models depending on the situational context for the movement, and multiple models may be employed in a single neighborhood revitalization initiative as their usefulness may hold distinct relevancy depending on the issue at hand (Eichler, 2007).

Conflict and Consensus Organizing

Activists for social change have historically been called to take a stance on issues as a tool to influence social change. Changing power relationships and resources through social action against power structures has been considered a viable strategy for helping promote social justice and fairness for the disadvantaged in society (Alinsky, 1971; Perlman & Gurin, 1972). Conflict theory asserts that social problems arise from competition over limited resources, and individuals will fight over the distribution of those resources (Cox, Erlich, Rothman & Tropman, 1974). Conflict organizing is considered to be a form of radical community organizing (Reisch,

2005). The conflict organizing model is a neighborhood-based approach to organizing which incorporates strategies of advocacy and lobbying to enact change (Cnaan, Boddie & Yancey, 2005).

The consensus organizing model is a framework for community organizing that promotes linking the self-interests of the community with the self-interests of others in order to work toward a shared goal (Eichler, 2007). In 1967, Ross and Lappin explained consensus organizing as the process of strengthening and integrating community participation for social action, and defined the role of the community organizer as one primarily concerned with building consensus (Perlman & Gurin, 1972). Consensus organizing has roots in the settlement-type approach, and assumes that a common ground can be reached among those with shared interests on any particular issue or problem (Cox et al., 1974). This approach is concerned with uniting interests within a neighborhood and aligning those interests with political, economic and social structures outside of the neighborhood (Eichler, 2007), and is a blend of empowerment practice for the disenfranchised, and the building of consensual relationships (Beck & Eichler, 2000). Tenets of consensus organizing include the theory of change assumption that power can be created through mutual self-interests, residents and people in power structures can work collaboratively to organize a change strategy, and relationship and partnership building is a central strategy to achieving sustainable, impactful change (Ohmer & DeMasi, 2009).

In comparing and contrasting these two models, one major difference, according to Beck and Eichler (2000), is that consensus organizing does not promote mass movements, conflict, or the redistribution of power. Another contrast is their differing perspectives of power structures. The conflict organizing model considers power structures as an oppressive opposition toward achieving social justice, and as useful primarily as an avenue to be coerced and pressured into

complying with the demands of a community group. In contrast, the consensus organizing model views power structures as potential partners and support system for a common cause (Eichler, 2007). Other differences in conflict and consensus organizing perspectives are: (1) consensus organizers believe power does not have to be redistributed, rather it can be developed and grown; and (2) mutual self-interest is a motivator for change, not only self-interest, as is the belief of conflict organizers (Beck & Eichler, 2000). However, one commonality of the two models is that conflict is not wholly absent from consensus building models – for example, a set of common goals may be recognized but the avenue to achieving those goals may differ substantially (Cox et al., 1974). The distinction between the conflict model and the consensus model is that in the former model, conflict is embraced and viewed as a mechanism to promote the cause, and in the latter model, conflict is viewed as necessary means to an end to be dealt with and overcome (Cox et al., 1974). Another primary commonality of the divergent strategies is the end game – as both models seek to advocate for social and political change to better serve persons in need and to empower people in pursuit of healthier communities.

According to Cox, Erlich, Rothman and Tropman (1974), strategies of community organizing that are most effective do not limit themselves to any one particular tactic or model, but rather move flexibly to employ strategies that are most appropriate in consideration of the context of the existing situation or issue. Beck and Eichler (2000) supported this assertion, imploring organizers to learn both conflict and consensus organizing strategies and to allow the issue to inform the methods used. Further, disenfranchised persons which are the target of a community organizing intervention have the greatest understanding of their own needs, what social changes to pursue and the strategies best to pursue them (Pyles, 2009).

Community Development and History of Public Housing Policy

As the field of community organizing has evolved over the past century, so have the related fields of community development and housing policy and programs. In general, contemporary community development theories maintain that strategic social interventions can bring about positive social change, with the goal of improving social and economic welfare (Midgley & Livermore, 2005). In the US today, the domain of community development is concerned with addressing poverty and stabilizing communities through comprehensive, place-based initiatives (von Hoffman, 2012), and transforming low-wealth communities while improving outcomes for low-income individuals (Belsky & Fauth, 2012). Over the past century, the community development field has increasingly informed public housing and urban planning approaches, which has resulted in a shift from a planning orientation primarily concerned with fixing problems, to one concerned with building on assets (von Hoffman, 2012). Successful community development is driven by the local agenda and promotes building up communities, strengthening assets, and cultivating partnerships between local entities and cross-governmental partners, as opposed to fixating on the problems of people and places through a prescriptive, top-down lens (Blanchard, 2012; Midgley & Livermore, 2005; von Hoffman, 2012). As with community organizing, the origins of the field of community development in the US can be traced back to the Settlement House movement of the late 19th century, when social reformers advocated for better living conditions resulting from industrial poverty (von Hoffman, 2012).

The field of community development with its emphasis on holistic transformation carried forward into the 21st century the tradition of comprehensive urban revitalization rooted in the Settlement House movement (Berry, 1986; von Hoffman, 2012). In the Progressive Era, the community development movement was concerned with political, social and physical reform

(O'Donnell, 1996). President Roosevelt's New Deal programs of the 1930s in response to the Great Depression consisted of a broad range of projects including public housing and neighborhood revitalization, which reflected much of the original aim of the 19th century settlement houses. In the 1960s, the Great Society programs aimed to promote antipoverty initiatives, preserving the theme of comprehensive neighborhood renewal that persists in community development today (Erickson, 2009; von Hoffman, 2012). In theory, comprehensive antipoverty strategies to improve housing and promote welfare were an important agenda, but the practice of community development was predominantly a top-down approach, leaving the people out of the planning and decision-making who the strategies intended to support.

With President Roosevelt's New Deal in the 1930's, places categorized as "slums" were transformed into public housing communities (von Hoffman, 2012). The nation's first low-income housing policies – the National Housing Act and the US Housing Act – were initiated in 1934 and 1937, respectively, as key legislation under the New Deal (HUD, 2010). The public housing program was established to support job creation, slum abatement, and to provide affordable housing (HUD, 2010; Schwartz, 2010). Federal housing policy currently supports low-income individuals and families in three primary ways: a) rental assistance for low-income persons; b) providing states and local governments with block grants for housing programs; and c) project-based subsidies for housing developments (Schwartz, 2010).

One major failed policy of the early history of the public housing program was the 'Neighborhood Composition Rule' (Larsen, 2002; Rothstein, 2015). The Neighborhood Composition Rule stated that public housing should not change the racial composition of a neighborhood (Kraus, 2004). This rule was concerned with neighborhoods with mixed-race compositions, and promoted segregation by limiting the selection of tenants into the public

housing communities based on a majority rule, "whichever group had predominated prior to demolition of the slums would be the only group to be admitted" (von Hoffman, 2012, p.13).

The public housing program came to a halt during World War II (Schwartz, 2010), when simultaneously urban neighborhoods saw an influx of racial minorities seeking to fill the ever-increasing demand for industrial jobs. This population surge heightened racial tensions and amplified the need for public welfare assistance (von Hoffman, 2012). Post World War II there existed a widespread shortage of public housing (Hays, 1995).

The 1949 Housing Act legislation reinstituted the public housing program and led to the construction of 5 million residential housing units over the sixty years to follow, including 1.4 million of public housing stock (Schwartz, 2010). A key component of the federal Housing Act of 1949 was the urban redevelopment program (renamed "urban renewal" with the Housing Act of 1954), a federal policy to demolish blighted neighborhoods and abate urban decay, allowing local governments, planners and private developers to invest in the physical and economic rebuilding of urban centers (Hays, 1995; von Hoffman, 2012). Urban planners saw this program as a promising mechanism to reduce the outmigration of the middle class and to curb urban disinvestment. Once again, this top-down policy failed to include residents and homeowners whose properties were a casualty of the redevelopment program (von Hoffman, 2012).

Though the 1949 Housing Act served to revive the public housing program that had become stagnant during the war, urban redevelopment resulted in displaced residents and failed to provide adequate replacement housing to meet the needs of low-wealth individuals and families (von Hoffman, 2012). The 1954 Housing Act presented a decreased emphasis on housing development in the urban renewal program, recognizing the need for comprehensive reform of city centers to combat disinvestment and suburbanization (Flanagan, 1997). The urban

renewal program flourished through the 1950s and 1960s, resulting in the development of central business districts and viable city centers, but it also advanced suburbanization and provided federal subsidies to private developers for unprofitable projects (Hays, 1995).

In some cities, political leadership purposefully planned the development of new public housing construction in predominantly low-income, minority neighborhoods, exacerbating the neighborhood effects of social isolation, racial segregation and concentrated poverty. In the 1950s, the State of Illinois gave Chicago City Council members veto authority for proposed public housing developments within their own districts, resulting in blatant segregation of public housing developments into predominantly black communities (Hays, 1995). In the landmark class action lawsuit in Chicago in 1966, Gautreaux v. Chicago Housing Authority (CHA), the CHA was ultimately found in violation of the US Constitution (Schwartz, 2010). In the 1950s and 1960s it built the majority of its public housing developments in predominantly black neighborhoods, and refused to allow black individuals and families to reside in public housing in predominantly white communities (Schill, 1997).

During the 1960s, suburban America experienced rapid development growth, sparking a mass exodus of people moving out of inner cities that would span over the next three decades (Wilson, 1987). By 1990, many inner cities experienced population declines by up to two-thirds of their composition a mere decade earlier (von Hoffman, 2012). With the rapid population growth in the suburbs, the need for highway expansions and building of expressways led to the destruction of many inner city communities (Halpern, 1995). Massive public housing structures emerged (von Hoffman, 2012). The urban core continued to be intrinsically tied to the urban poor, impacting neighborhoods, displacing residents, failing to provide adequate and timely

replacement housing, disintegrating social network ties, and perpetuating social and economic poverty (Hays, 1995).

In 1964, President Johnson declared the War on Poverty, and legislated the Economic Opportunity Act. This Act consisted of antipoverty measures to provide opportunities for economic mobility, through programs to promote education, jobs, health and neighborhood improvements (von Hoffman, 2012). In 1965, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development was established to oversee public housing and subsidy programs, including the management of multiple community and economic development programs (Schwartz, 2010). Pinsky (2012) asserted that it was during this era that what is known today as community development emerged, along with the inception of community action agencies and community development corporations. Additionally, von Hoffman (2012) stated that community development progressed during this decade, with antipoverty policies and community development projects finally embracing a bottom-up approach, beginning to recognize the value of inclusion of impacted residents in community development and neighborhood revitalization efforts. The War on Poverty's community action program was structured in order to maximize the participation of residents in low-wealth communities. Community development corporations were established into federal law in 1966 (von Hoffman, 2012).

Model Cities was the first federal program established in the 1960s as a comprehensive and ambitious approach to transforming communities by integrating people-based and place-based strategies across federal agencies (von Hoffman, 2012; Belsky & Fauth, 2012). Designed to coordinate federal programs in low-income neighborhoods, Model Cities was ultimately unsuccessful before it even reached the local level, as it proved too difficult to secure cooperation from various federal agencies and organizations (Schwartz, 2010; von Hoffman,

2012; Belsky & Fauth, 2012). Despite the failure of this program, the community development field has continued to value a holistic, comprehensive community development approach (Belsky & Fauth, 2012).

In 1974, a new era in community development and urban policy emerged with the passing of the Housing and Community Development Act, which replaced Model Cities and the urban renewal program with Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) (Schwartz, 2012; von Hoffman, 2003, 2012). CDBGs reduced federal involvement in local community development, promoted citizen involvement in CDBG projects, and reasserted rehabilitation as a primary housing strategy (Hays, 1995). CDBGs are the largest block grant program and these funds can be used for a broad range of programming at the discretion of the local municipality (Schwartz, 2010).

The 1974 Housing and Community Development Act also introduced the Section 8 housing subsidy program (HUD, 2010). Section 8 persists today as the most widespread form of low-income housing assistance, providing rent subsidies for low-income individuals and families to private housing owners. Low-income households are provided with housing vouchers, and this formula-based program makes up the difference between 30% of the household's income and the maximum rental fee allowable (Schwartz, 2010). The existing federal tax savings for real estate investors combined with Section 8 vouchers resulted in a proliferation of low-income privately owned housing developments (von Hoffman, 2003, 2012). Despite these newly introduced federal policies and programs, inner city neighborhoods continued to decline (von Hoffman, 2003).

Through the 1970s and 1980s, community development efforts focused on creating opportunity in the places where low-income people lived, and building the assets and capacity of

individuals. Federal policies recognized the need for multiple partners across the public and private sectors and increased local control (Erickson, 2009). Complicating the pursuit of the goal to create healthier communities, community developers found that when programs were successful in building skills and led to economic opportunity, people chose to move out of the neighborhood they were working to rebuild, taking their human capital along with them. The assets of individuals were being built up, but neighborhoods were not improved (von Hoffman, 2012).

In 1986 the real estate development tax incentives were eliminated and replaced with Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC). The LIHTC program was established to create new opportunities for affordable housing for low and moderate income families (HUD, 2010), and has financed over 2.5 million homes since its inception, widely recognized as an immensely powerful housing program initiative (von Hoffman, 2012). As a result of the enactment of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977, the 1990s experienced a surge of bank loans to developers for LIHTC program deals. Investment in inner-city neighborhoods was one primary emphasis of the Community Reinvestment Act (von Hoffman, 2012).

The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative launched in Boston in 1984 as a result of the Boston Redevelopment Authority's proposal for an urban renewal project in the Roxbury Neighborhood. This project called for the construction of office towers and high-end hotels in the Dudley Street Neighborhood. Motivated by fear of the potential for gentrification, residents came together to develop and propose their own plan for neighborhood transformation. This plan promoted the revitalization and development of housing, parks and recreational facilities, gardens, community centers, and local retail (von Hoffman, 2012). In 1988 the resident-led Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative was the first community group in the nation to receive

power of eminent domain from the City of Boston's Redevelopment Authority to oversee development projects in their neighborhood (Brueggemann, 2010; Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative [DSNI], 2015; Taylor, 1995). The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative's model of comprehensive neighborhood transformation was successful largely because of its efforts to establish a common vision for change across all stakeholder groups, its commitment to community organizing, practice of authentic resident engagement – including shared power in decision-making, and the coordination of cross-sector partners and stakeholders through project implementation (Brueggemann, 2010; DSNI, 2015; von Hoffman, 2012).

Inspired by the success of the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, in the 1990s many national foundations began investing in comprehensive community development initiatives. The Ford Foundation established the Neighborhood and Family Initiative, which targeted disinvested, low-wealth urban communities in the cities of Detroit, Hartford, Memphis and Milwaukee (Chaskin, Chipenda-Dansokho, Joseph, & Richards, 2001). The Rebuilding Communities Initiative, funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, reflected a similar goal for comprehensive neighborhood-level transformation in Boston, Denver, Detroit and Philadelphia (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2015). These national organizations targeted their investments to local philanthropic and community organizations in the designated cities, and these local organizations served as the coordinator of collaborative partners and residents driven by local agendas for comprehensive neighborhood renewal (von Hoffman, 2012).

Though many of these local initiatives accomplished a great deal during their tenure, addressing a host of place-based issues including crime, education, housing, and employment, most did not achieve the level of success they originally intended and failed to sustain themselves beyond the confines of the original funding investment (Trent & Chavis, 2009; von

Hoffman, 2012). These initiatives tended to lack a collective focus on holistic change, and instead fixated on more manageable, specialized projects. Lessons learned from these initiatives that further informed the community development field included the need for achievable, clearly defined goals, purposeful relationship building, alignment and leveraging with related community endeavors, and an understanding that transformative, sustainable change takes time and sustainable investment (Trent & Chavis, 2009). As a result of the mixed success of comprehensive neighborhood initiatives, in the 2000s most national foundations discontinued these programs (von Hoffman, 2012).

The HOPE VI program was introduced by HUD in 1993, with the goal of replacing dilapidated public housing structures with the development of new housing communities, mixing a range of income groups through various types of housing units, including single family units, apartments, condominiums and townhomes (HUD, 2010; Popkin et al., 2004). Though many foundations had moved away from comprehensive community development initiatives, the emergence of HOPE VI solidified the federal government's commitment to this goal (von Hoffman, 2012). Mixed-income housing can be used to describe a housing community built with the intention of mixing groups of incomes in a single development (Brophy & Smith, 1997), and this approach has been used to address neighborhoods of concentrated poverty and racial segregation. These types of developments often include a combination of affordable housing and market-rate multifamily dwellings (Joseph, Chaskin & Webber, 2007).

HOPE VI operated from 1993 to 2007, and originally focused on the demolition of distressed public housing, replaced by new, lower density housing developments made available to a wider range of income levels, and emphasized the empowerment of residents (Popkin et al., 2004; Schwartz, 2010). HOPE VI was designed to promote public-private partners to replace

distressed public housing communities with a higher quality housing stock for people from a range of financial abilities, including low and moderate incomes. Local housing authorities served as the lead organization for most HOPE VI initiatives (von Hoffman, 2012). Over time the HOPE VI goals became more ambitious, to include the revitalization of inner cities and eliminate concentrated poverty (Schwartz, 2012). As HUD recognized that people could not escape poverty through improvements in bricks and mortar alone, housing authorities were expected to embrace a holistic approach to the HOPE VI housing communities (Popkin et al., 2004). Subsequently, this took shape through the establishment of job training programs, childcare centers, recreational facilities and health care services within HOPE VI projects (Popkin et al., 2004; von Hoffman, 2012).

The high degree of capital investment necessary to achieve the construction of HOPE VI communities have led to its reputation as an expensive program with questionable outcomes (von Hoffman, 2012), though some scholars note the long term benefits outweigh the upfront expenses (Turner et al., 2007). A national evaluation of the HOPE VI program noted the program's success at demolishing severely distressed housing, the development of quality mixed-income housing, and improvements to neighborhoods that formerly surrounded distressed public housing (Popkin et al., 2004). As urban communities in many large cities underwent transformations from high crime, poverty-ridden neighborhoods into viable communities, with access to quality education and other desirable neighborhood amenities, many families and professionals with higher income levels took notice. Though most agree the HOPE VI projects were an improvement to the distressed public housing they replaced, an important concern about the HOPE VI projects was the displacement of residents and lack of a one-for-one replacement strategy, whereas the number of new public housing units built in these mixed income

developments was not equivalent to the number of public housing units demolished (Popkin et al., 2004; Schwartz, 2010). HUD awarded 234 HOPE VI grants from 1993-2007. This resulted in a total of 96,226 public housing units were demolished and another 11,961 rehabilitated (Schwartz, 2010, p. 145). Only 55% of those units have been or will be replaced with new and rehabilitated public housing units; however, upon closer examination, the equivalent of 81% of public housing units that were occupied prior to demolition are accounted for with the new construction, as up to a third of the public housing units targeted by HOPE VI developments were deemed vacant or uninhabitable prior to demolition (Schwartz, 2010, p. 145).

In addition to concerns over making available an equivalent number of public housing units to low-income persons as were prior to demolition are the concerns over those residents displaced from their communities during demolition and construction. Residents in these circumstances have been left with two main choices: a) receive a Section 8 voucher to find a private market rental through housing choice; or b) move to a vacant unit in another public housing development (Popkin, 2002; Schwartz, 2010). Residents who have chosen to return to the new HOPE VI development in their community of origin have had to pass a series of eligibility requirements, often including criteria related to credit history, criminal history, employment, enrollment in school, or enrollment in a vocational training program (Popkin, 2002; Popkin, Cunningham & Burt, 2005; Schwartz, 2010). According to Schwartz, "As of September 2008, about 24% of the original public housing residents had relocated to completed HOPE VI developments" (2010, p. 147). Studies of former residents displaced by HOPE VI projects who opted for the housing choice vouchers have found most relocated to neighborhoods with lower overall poverty rates, and many reported they felt safer and were highly satisfied with their new housing and neighborhoods (Popkin et al., 2004; Schwartz, 2010).

Despite the ambitious goals of HOPE VI to develop vibrant communities for low-income individuals and families, gentrification remains a potential consequence of revitalization, and poverty persists. The new HOPE VI developments improved living conditions in the neighboring communities, and made these more desirable places to live (Popkin et al., 2004). In many communities, the influx of upper income families and individuals moving into revitalized urban neighborhoods detrimentally impacted the lower income families that these initiatives were created to support, by driving up rent and property taxes beyond affordable levels for those left behind in the lower income brackets (von Hoffman, 2012).

As a result of the Great Recession, the percentage of Americans living in poverty reached a height of 15.1% in 2010, the highest rate of poverty since the mid-1990s (Donovan, Duncan & Sebelius, 2012, p.108; von Hoffman, 2012). It is estimated that another 50 million Americans are on the verge of falling below the poverty threshold (Donovan, Duncan & Sebelius, 2012, p.108). In 2014, federal housing policy continues to aim to combat geographically concentrated poverty through comprehensive urban revitalization. Though the federal government has been investing in inner cities since the 1990s, it has been suggested that the Obama administration is the first since the Great Society era to implement comprehensive strategies for urban transformation, championed through the recently formed White House Office of Urban Affairs and Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (Price, 2011).

More recently, place-based policies and programs have been shown to be effective through initiatives such as the Harlem Children's Zone in New York City, which promotes community development through cradle-to-career supports with education as the foundation (Tough, 2008). Led by Geoffrey Canada, and in part the inspiration behind the White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative of 2010 (von Hoffman, 2012), the Harlem Children's

Zone is administered by the US Department of Education, also a White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative program and sister to the HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative (Turner, 2010). As the Choice Neighborhoods and Promise Neighborhoods initiatives are concerned with aligning and leveraging federal, state and local resources for community transformation, they are similar to the Model Cities program (von Hoffman, 2012). These programs appear to more adequately address the issue of segregation by developing viable, mixed-income neighborhoods of opportunity, which eliminate the need for costly mobility programs of questionable effectiveness and more fully address the issue of concentrated poverty.

The HUD Choice Neighborhood Initiative replaced the HOPE VI initiative, including stipulations to address the shortcomings of its predecessor, such as requiring: a) one-for-one public housing replacement requirements; b) requiring housing authorities to detail plans to ensure the well-being of residents displaced through the process; c) an emphasis on public participation and community engagement and d) the transformation of entire neighborhoods including severely distressed public housing communities (NLIHC, 2011). The Choice Neighborhood initiative promotes localized, innovative, place-based, people-oriented strategies that engage partners across various levels of government, nonprofits, the private sector, philanthropists, and community residents (Turner, 2010). To be implemented as it was intended, it relies on the outreach to, engagement of, and leadership from the community itself (Price, 2011).

Community Development and Resident Engagement

Meaningful community engagement in antipoverty initiatives for comprehensive urban revitalization is the act of leveraging "social capital in low-income neighborhoods to allow citizens to influence the policies that impact their well-being" (Price, 2011, p. 65). Community

development recognizes at its core that people are the assets and solutions to improving their communities, not problems to be fixed (Blanchard, 2012). Residents are the experts about their communities (Ohmer & DeMasi, 2009); and the leadership to move communities forward already exists within the neighborhood (Blanchard, 2012; Ohmer & DeMasi, 2009). Marginalized neighborhoods consist of people who have traditionally been left out of planning, decision-making and leadership in the implementation of transformation in their own communities (Blackwell, 2012). Models of economic development which rely on outside experts rather than resident assets and articulated needs are deficient, and a lack of effective communication between residents and local leadership is cited as a primary barrier that perpetuates social isolation and prohibits movement toward positive outcomes (O'Hara, 2001).

Authentic and intentional community engagement is a critical mechanism for establishing an equity agenda that empowers disconnected residents and devises sustainable strategies for building community (Blackwell, 2012). Authentic engagement is achieved when residents are involved in the planning and decision-making about their communities, working collaboratively to create a common vision for positive change for the future (Whaley & Weaver, 2010). Resident engagement is integral to neighborhood transformation (Pinsoneault & Hoorn, 2014), and the deepest level of community engagement works to promote positive change and achieve sustainable community outcomes (Whaley & Weaver, 2010). Authentic engagement is reflected in the close relationships of people in systems, organizations and processes entrenched in the shared value of engagement working toward common goals (Pinsoneault & Hoorn, 2014).

The WHNRI (2011) recognized that "neighborhood revitalization is about improving neighborhoods with neighbors by working together to: 1) solve local problems; 2) address inequalities of wealth and power; 3) promote democratic values and practice; 4) improve the

potential of each individual and the community; and 5) build a sense of community." Building on this message, sustainable transformation is deemed achievable only when residents and cross-sector partners are working together toward improving well-being and life outcomes across a community (WHNRI, 2011). The Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center (n.d.) promotes that effective community planning brings together relationships with resources to achieve results. According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003), key principles for effective resident engagement emphasize embracing diversity, respecting collective community knowledge, building capacity of residents and communities, and sharing power through decision-making and responsibility in order to mobilize communities to action and improve results.

When residents are fully and authentically engaged in neighborhood transformation and have power in decision-making, authentic demand can occur. Authentic demand is defined as the "individual and community capacity to define, articulate and work for results" (Ahsan, 2008, p.4). Authentic demand depends on strong and positive social networks, capacity building and leadership opportunities, and civic participation and leadership for residents led by community organizing efforts (Ahsan, 2008). Authentic participation of residents in developing and implementing strategies to build their own communities is an essential strategy for effective community development (Seidman, 2012).

Theoretical Frameworks

Theory is a useful tool that allows social workers and community practitioners to gain insight into and to structure information in a logical and systematic way in order to understand human social life and behavior through relationships and situations (Hutchinson, 2003). As the Choice Neighborhood approach to comprehensive community planning emphasizes neighbor participation in order to successfully transform neighborhoods in meaningful, sustainable ways

(Evidence Matters, 2011), building social capital is a critical investment in the civic economy that facilitates the opportunity for this type of transformation. Poverty has been described as the lack of capital (Crane & Heaton, 2008), and according to the community capitals framework, healthy, vibrant communities possess strengths of resources in seven types of capital: financial, natural, human, built, political, cultural and social (Emery & Flora, 2006). Marginalized, impoverished and socially isolated communities experience a combination of these capital deficits. The theoretical frameworks of ecological systems theory and social capital theory are examined to understand the dynamic impacts of the problems of poverty, social isolation, and impoverished communities.

Ecological Systems Theory

The person-in-environment perspective – the meaning of interactions among persons and within their environments at a particular time – captures a broad view of the world that has helped guide the development of social work theory (Hutchinson, 2003). Ecological systems theory guides an understanding of the relationship between a person and their environment. It is a broad, over-arching framework derived from general social systems and ecological perspectives (Dale et al., 2006; Lesser & Pope, 2007; Schriver, 2004). This theory is a cross-disciplinary approach, integrating concepts from psychology, biology and sociology into an interconnected system (Hutchinson, 2003; Lesser & Pope, 2007), and is currently a predominant theoretical paradigm for the social work field (Dale et al., 2006). Sociologists Parsons and Merton, psychologists Lewin and Bronfenbrenner, and biologist Von Bertalanffy were key contributors to this perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1986; Lewin, 1931; Merton, 1938; Parsons, 1950; Von Bertalanffy, 1972). Central propositions of ecological systems theory include that: (a) systems are comprised of unique parts (individuals and system groups), which are goal

oriented and purpose driven, that are interrelated and conjoined to make up a larger whole; (b) each part of the system has an active and reciprocal influence on the other parts and the larger whole; (c) systems themselves are subsystems of even larger, suprasystems; (d) systems have unique identities – the whole system is defined distinctly from the entirety of its subsystems – and boundaries provide identity; (e) interactions and exchanges within, between, and among systems impact one another, and transformation in one part of the system results in changes across systems (Hutchinson, 2003; Lesser & Pope, 2007).

Ecological systems theory differs from social systems theory primarily based on its explicit inclusion of the physical environment among the network of interrelated systems, but otherwise these theories are strikingly similar in concepts, propositions, and assumptions, and largely treated in the literature as such (Schriver, 2004). Systems theory views human behavior as a product of reciprocal interactions within, between, and among systems. The individual themselves are viewed as whole systems, comprised of psychological, biological and sociocultural environmental parts (Lesser & Pope, 2007). Even as the individual is considered a whole system unto itself, this theory asserts that individuals are in dynamic reciprocal roles within microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems, and macrosystems in society and the physical environment that are influenced by culture, history and situational context (Darling, 2007). Bronfenbrenner's (1979) concepts of the individual as an active role and the phenomenological nature of interactions are central to this theory. Individuals are considered to function in a dynamic relationship within a multitude of systems, where they continuously contribute to the formation of, induce responses from, and react to these environmental systems (Darling, 2007). Systems theory is applicable for understanding human behavior and functioning in the context of individuals, groups, families, organizations, communities and societies (Dale et al., 2006).

Ecological systems theory allows social workers to study community systems as a whole, and to promote prevention, intervention and revitalization practices that consider the larger system as well as sub-systems and individuals simultaneously (Lesser & Pope, 2007). Ecological systems theory provides a framework for understanding pervasive poverty within communities, with applicability to multiple levels and through multiple means of helping to meet the needs of individuals and communities, and promoting the healthy functioning of individuals and groups within their social and physical environments (Lesser & Pope, 2007; Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000).

Community development strives to improve, leverage and enhance community resources, facilitate partnerships and collaborations across nonprofit and governmental agencies, community organizations and other subsystems, and promote the accessibility of these resources by all members of the community (Dale et al., 2006). The concept of community is defined as a social system comprised of interrelated subsystems that aims to provide its members with access to the things they need in order to function (Hardcastle, Wenocur & Powers, 1997).

In neighborhood transformation initiatives ecological systems theory is a particularly useful tool in understanding the relationships, networks and systems that contribute to the quality of life for individuals and families in the context of a physical place. Individuals have unique strengths and challenges, as do the communities within which they live. Communities are influenced by the strengths and challenges of the individuals that comprise the community system, and simultaneously influence individuals within the community by the community's strengths and challenges collectively (Edelman, 2012). "The places where we live, learn, work, and play transform us" (p. 411); people are influenced by the communities and systems within which they live, and communities are influenced by the people that live within them (Andrews &

Retsinas, 2012). Ecological, economical, political, and social forces within neighborhoods create opportunities or present barriers for individual residents in regards to quality of life outcomes. These forces combined, often referred to as the social determinants of health, intersect to influence individual and community health and are primary concerns of community development practitioners (Erickson, Galloway & Cytron, 2012).

As it related to Choice Neighborhoods, the basic concept of trust is a quality of the individual residents, but also a collective phenomenon influenced by ecological forces, such as access and availability of community resources in the physical environment, social networks and reciprocal relationships among neighbors, interactions between neighbors and various systems within the community (e.g. government, school, religious institutions), and social policies and programs. The ecological framework provides a vehicle for strategically analyzing how a community functions, how individuals function within a community, and how to direct and plan an intervention targeted for a specific community.

Using a multi-dimensional approach to understanding human behavior and social situations allows community practitioners to most fully provide explanations for the behaviors, structures and situations they are trying to understand (Hutchinson, 2003). Connecting multiple theoretical perspectives allows for a deeper level of insight into the phenomena community practitioners are attempting to explain (Hutchinson, 2003). Ecological systems theory can also be useful in providing an over-arching framework for understanding theories in connection to one another, as it can be considered a suprasystem unto itself, under which other theories can be connected and organized into subsystems in order to explain phenomena (Siporin, 1980). Although ecological systems theory has been used in combination with a multitude of additional theoretical perspectives as a multi-dimensional approach, social capital theory is particularly

useful in understanding community systems, development and the capacity to build social capital and reliable, reciprocal networks of trust.

Social Capital Theory

Social capital theory provides explanation for the assets and resources attached to human relationships, and is an important theory to understanding of poverty and community development (Putnam, 2000a; Schriver, 2004). Social capital is an emerging theory derived from Marx's early notions of capital, where capital is described as the "surplus value captured by capitalists or the bourgeoisie, who control the means of production" (Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008, p. 4). Capital is considered the investment of the surplus value with anticipated returns. Nan Lin (2008), a seminal scholar of social capital theory, terms later theories evolving from Marx's classical capital theory – human-capital, cultural capital, and social capital theories – neocapital theories, because they assert surplus value and investments can be acquired by the masses and not solely capitalists. Social capital theory originally developed in the 1980's, and pioneers of social capital theory included Bourdieu, who conceptualized cultural capital theory, Loury and Coleman. Later influential leaders in the conceptualization of social capital include Portes, Lin, and Putnam (Bourdieu, 1993; Loury, 1995; Coleman, 1998; Portes, 2000; Lin, 2008; and Putnam, 2000a).

Early social capital theory conceptualization focused on the individual gains and assets in relationship-based resources between and among individuals and networks (Briggs, 1997; Coleman, 1998; Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008; Putnam, 2000a). In consideration of this conceptualization, social capital can be measured by the strength of those relationships and subsequently the additional resources to which they have access due to those relations (Edwards, 2009); further, Bourdieu's work asserted that people intentionally develop relationships in

anticipation of later material and social returns (Bourdieu, 1993; Portes, 2000). Social capital has been defined as the "investment in social relations with expected returns" (Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008, p. 6). Social capital is conceptualized through Lin's work as structurally embedded resources, the degree of accessibility to those resources and the purposeful usage of those resources (Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008). Putnam's *Bowling Alone* book (2000a) brought mainstream popularity to the concept of social capital. Putman's emphasis on the social capital of community diverged from the fidelity of the pioneering work of Bourdieu and Coleman, and has brought about lively debate in the field of sociology pertaining to the conceptualization of the theory (Edwards, 2009).

Social capital theory has been used to understand family, neighborhood, city, societal, and cultural systems, and the degree of wealth within those relationships (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Schriver, 2004). Social capital can be defined in the community context as the aggregated value of economic, political, social and cultural assets of a community (Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008). The distinction between macro-level perspectives of social capital and micro conceptualizations is whether social capital is a collective asset or an individual commodity, and most scholars believe it is both (Lin, Cook & Burt, 2008). However, micro conceptualizations of social capital are the foundation of this theoretical framework, and early definitions of social capital included community only in regards to its potential value for contributing to individual capital (Portes, 2000). Micro definitions of social capital are concerned with the capacity of individuals in their relationships – and how social supports are utilized to help individuals cope with life situations, and leveraged to negotiate changes or advancements in life circumstances (Schriver, 2004).

Irrespective of this ongoing debate over the definition of social capital, Putnam is recognized among the premier researchers to have contributed to the understanding of social

capital as a community-level resource to improve individual outcomes (Brisson & Usher, 2007; Schriver, 2004). The theory of social capital emphasizes the relationship between economics and social capital, and has evolved from its early focus on individuals to its applicability to community systems (Schriver, 2004). Putnam contributed to this evolution with his work on understanding public capital, which is concerned with the social capital of groups within communities (Putnam, 2000a; Schriver, 2004). The premise behind Putman's theory of social capital is the belief that greater closeness among people leads to heightened levels of trust, which leads to greater individual and collective well-being. Putnam defined two categories of social capital: bonding capital – bringing people closer through interactions, and bridging capital – bringing new groups of people together (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Beck & Eichler, 2000; Edwards, 2009).

Literature has described social capital as a useful means of attaining challenging policy goals (Dhillon, 2009), and as community development projects are concerned with addressing social policy issues, the intentional facilitation of social capital as part of a community development project is a useful tool. Additionally, Temkin and Rohe (1998) tested Putnam's theory of social capital, and found that both bonding capital and bridging capital were simultaneously necessary to bring about positive community change, and that social capital was found to be a noteworthy predictor of neighborhood stability. Gittell and Vidal (1998) found that the consensus organizing process produces gains in social capital in communities. Another benefit to the creation of social capital in community development initiatives is that with social capital comes heightened levels of power, influence and control, and power is a tool to enacting change (Adler & Kwon, 2002). The economic viability of a community is intrinsically tied to the social capital, which influences behaviors and outcomes for individuals (Edelman, 2012).

Mobilizing social capital is considered to be a critical element of successful community development initiatives (Midgley & Livermore, 2005).

Social capital and ecological systems theory are useful to understanding neighborhood transformation and the interconnectedness of relationships among individuals and systems, as well as the value and capacity those relationships carry in influencing changes across systems. There are three commonly recognized types of social capital situations, including horizontal social capital, hierarchical social capital, and the absence of social capital (Schriver, 2004). Horizontal social capital, in the context of ecological systems theory, means that social capital is functioning in a healthy capacity across systems, where community ties are strong and participation across subsystems in a community is high (Schriver, 2004), and the desirability standard of systems theory is a well-integrated, fluidly functioning system (Hardcastle, Wenocur, & Powers, 1997). A hierarchical social capital arrangement is another systems example, where the interests of a particular group or subsystem within a community are more heavily weighted than the interests of other subsystems within the larger community system (Schriver, 2004). The absence of social capital occurs when social systems are working in isolation from one another and networks are broken down, which is commonly found in communities of poverty (Schriver, 2004). Social isolation signifies a dearth of social capital, and is a characteristic inherently linked to communities in concentrated poverty, experiencing economic isolation (Hurlbert, Beggs & Haines, 2008; Wacquant & Wilson, 1989; Wilson, 1987). As these concepts are closely related, an expected return on building social capital is the growth of economic capital (Midgley & Livermore, 1998).

In the absence of social capital, systems are operating in a state of isolation, with closed capacity, whereas a fundamental tenet of systems theory is that healthy systems are open

systems, dynamically connected to the environments within which they function with the ongoing exchange of resources through inputs and outputs (Schriver, 2004). Putnam's concepts of bonding capital and bridging capital are related to systems theory as these concepts are concerned with the changes that occur in social capital by means of deepening established relationships and bridging new connections, and according to systems theory, deepening or forging activities between subsystems would result in dynamic changes and growth across systems. Social capital is the trust, networks, and reciprocity in relationships that exist among individuals and within communities, and investing in and mobilizing social capital is an important step in community transformation (Midgley & Livermore, 2005).

Review of Relevant Studies

Social Capital and Low-Wealth Neighborhoods

Social capital is considered to be an important strategy toward addressing neighborhood-level poverty and developing communities (Brisson & Usher, 2007; Midgley & Livermore, 2005). Although rebuilding and fostering social capital are considered key approaches to building community in distressed, low-wealth neighborhoods (Reim, 2013), there are limited studies to support (or deny) the assertion that social capital impacts neighborhood stability. In 1998, with an increasing emphasis on the importance of social capital development as a strategy to promote neighborhood revitalization and growth by policymakers and urban analysts, Temkin and Rohe (1998) explored whether social capital could have a positive effect on neighborhood stability. In their study, Temkin and Rohe explored whether the level of social capital in a neighborhood had an impact on that community's ability to successfully adapt to change, in order to understand whether building social capital in declining neighborhoods was a worthwhile endeavor.

Temkin and Rohe presented two elements of a social capital model, sociocultural milieu (akin to trust – one conceptualization of social capital as defined by Putnam, 1993) and institutional infrastructure (akin to civic engagement – a second conceptualization of social capital by Putnam, 1993). Civic engagement was operationalized as institutional infrastructure, and involves a wide range of variables that capture levels of public participation of residents (e.g. voting activity and perceived effectiveness of neighborhood organizations). Sociocultural milieu was the operationalization of the social capital dimension of trust and sense of community, and included variables measuring neighboring activities (e.g. interactions, working and socializing in the neighborhood, use of neighborhood facilities, actions of visiting, helping, and borrowing) (Temkin & Rohe, 1998). The researchers analyzed the effects of different levels of social capital across 179 census tracts in Pittsburgh neighborhoods between 1980-1990 to assess whether the levels of social capital in 1980 could predict neighborhood stability over the following decade. In order to create a measure for social capital, the researchers developed a social capital model of neighborhood change, and used these data to identify sociocultural milieu variables and institutional infrastructure variables via separate principal components analyses. Political activity, neighborhood loyalty and attachment, and perceptions of whether the neighborhood was a good place to live were identified as the constructs that formed their measure of social capital. Using a regression model, with change in housing prices as the dependent variable, they found that social capital has a positive and significant effect on neighborhood stability. They concluded that, over time, neighborhoods with higher levels of social capital were more likely to remain stable.

Temkin and Rohe's study is useful in identifying an effective means to conceptualize, operationalize and empirically analyze social capital, which is often considered and debated to be

an abstract concept in the literature. The researchers explain there is not a one-size-fits-all handbook for building social capital within a community, and that social capital only plays one role in the process for neighborhood stability. Further, they recommend building social capital should be an organic process, where community participation is fostered, community building should be comprehensive, and based on the unique strengths and needs of the neighborhood.

As resident displacement continues to be a concern with community development projects that through construction disrupt individual and family living conditions, studying the impact of displacement on social capital is an important consideration. As previously noted, concentrated poverty is regarded as inextricably linked with social isolation, and subsequently a lack in social capital. However, the key to addressing poverty and building social capital is not as simple as de-concentrating it. In a study of the impact of relocation due to a HOPE VI project in Tampa, Florida, researchers found that residents relocated to higher wealth neighborhoods experienced a loss of sense of community, reported smaller social networks, fewer bridging ties, and found that relocation and deconcentration of poverty does not result in enhancing overall social capital. The researchers conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with 41 head of households and former public housing residents over a year and a half period from 2003 to 2004. In these interviews they discussed experiences and perceptions related to the relocation experience, social ties, feelings about the future and past, and activities and well-being of children in the home (Greenbaum, Hathaway, Rodriguez, Spalding & Ward, 2008).

Conceptualizations of Trust and Mistrust in Communities

Community organizing and community development rely on the building, strengthening and reparation of trust within the community among neighbors, from inside the community toward outside investors, allies and committed stakeholders, and from outside external partners

in order to strengthen neighborhoods. Healthy systems of relationships are the pathways to social, economic, environmental and physical interventions and opportunities, and relationships are dependent on the establishment of mutually beneficial goals that are grounded in trust. Trust is a fundamental component of social capital (Putnam, 2000; Pyles & Cross, 2008; Stolle, 2002; Usher, 2007), and though the concept of trust is complex and has been defined in a variety of ways, most commonly it is used to describe perceptions of relational interactions among and between people (Franzini, 2008; Ross, Mirowsky, & Pribesh, 2001). Trust has been described as the "belief in the integrity of other people" (Ross, Mirowsky, & Pribesh, 2001, p.569). It is the belief that others can be relied upon, and that interactions with others will lead to positive outcomes. Evidence has shown the individuals with high levels of trust tend to have more positive health outcomes, and neighborhood level trust as a social capital construct is related to positive health outcomes at the community level (Franzini, 2008; Kim & Kawachi, 2006; Subramanian, Kim & Kawachi, 2002).

Trust has been considered catalytic to the creation, support, and maintenance of social capital, resulting in strengthening neighborhoods (Usher, 2007). Without trust, reciprocal relationships are less likely to exist, civic engagement may be weak, and collective neighborhood capacity for transformation may be detrimentally impacted (Pyles & Cross, 2008). Trust is the building block for the formation of positive social relationships in pursuit of mutually beneficial goals (Coleman, 1998; Ross, Mirowsky & Pribesh, 2001). Trust can be influenced by not only individual characteristics and experiences, but also characteristics of the communities in which people live (Alesina & Ferrara, 2002).

The most widely utilized conceptualization of trust was defined by the social psychologist Rotter as "a generalized expectancy held by an individual that the word, promise,

oral or written statement of another individual or group can be relied on" (Rotter, 1980, p. 1). *Generalized trust* has been described as a broad attitude of general trust in others, including those not personally known; whereas *personalized trust* is commonly measured as the attitude of trust toward those with whom one has individual relationships and repeated interactions, as part of a closer, more immediate inner circle (Marschall & Stolle, 2004; Stolle, 2002; Uslaner, 2002; Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994). Identity-based trust, particularized trust, in-group trust and kinship trust are similar concepts that refer to the individual trust one has for others they identify with, that are personally known to them, and with whom they regularly interact (Stolle, 2002). Though in much of the literature generalized trust encapsulates this type of personalized trust, generalized trust (Yamagishi, 2001) – also known as interpersonal trust (Rotter, 1980), thin trust (Putnam, 2000a), and social trust (Hardin, 2002; Putnam, 2002) – it is primarily concerned with the general trust held for most other people, groups, and institutions, including those that one does not personally know or with whom one has little interaction. Putnam's (2002a) conceptualization of *social trust* includes both personalized trust (e.g. kinship and neighboring) as well as generalized trust (e.g. general trust in others and institutions, such as local government and law enforcement).

Generalized trust has been explained as "less intensive but more extensive" (Stolle, 2002, p. 399) than personalized trust, and studies have shown that generalized trust can be a stronger predictor of economic growth than other dimensions of social capital (Knack & Keefer, 1997; Stolle, 2002). Higher levels of engagement and cooperation are related to higher levels of generalized trust, and individuals who trust, the civic economy, and the social environment benefit when people are engaged and working cooperatively (Stolle, 2002).

Mistrust, on the other hand, has been defined as "an absence of faith in other people based on a belief that others are out for their own good and will exploit or victimize you in pursuit of their goals" (Ross, Mirowsky & Pribesh, 2001, p. 569). It exists when the perceived potential cost for negative outcomes of trusting behavior outweighs the perceived potential benefit for trusting behavior (Coleman, 1998; Smith, 2010). Mistrust can be detrimental to the civic economy, stifling progress and weakening the social fabric of communities. Yet high levels of mistrust – both personalized and generalized – characterize many vulnerable and marginalized communities, as living in distressed neighborhoods marked by chronic crime and concentrated poverty is prohibitive to a culture of openness and cooperation. In disinvested communities social isolation serves as a protective factor from perceived threats to one's safety and well-being, and the failed promises for progress from well meaning outsiders in the past perpetuate this state of isolation and general mistrust.

Trust, Social Capital and Neighborhood Disadvantage

In the neighborhood context, trust is both affected by community members as well as affects community members and the collective socio-ecological system (Smith, 2010). Research has shown that mistrust is amplified for people living in disadvantaged communities, where personal disadvantage and neighborhood disadvantage – a lack of resources and opportunities, heightened levels of crime and perceived threats to personal safety, and social disorder – contribute to a sense of personal powerlessness and vulnerability (Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowly, 2002). Social disorder in neighborhoods is the opposite of social control, where people respect each other and their respective property, where streets are free from litter and graffiti, where the potential for harm and threats to personal safety are perceived as minimal (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Social disorder magnifies perceptions of powerlessness for

community members, which further diminishes trust and generates mistrust (Aiyer, Zimmerman, Morrel-Samuels, & Reischl, 2015). People living in disadvantage – minorities, those in poverty, lacking education and in environments that limit access to opportunity – are more likely to be mistrusting, and less likely to have the social and economic supports that are found to generate trust (Ross, Mirowsky, & Pribesh, 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowly, 2002).

Lower levels of trust in institutions and generalized trust in others are more commonly associated with low-income minority groups (Franzini, 2008; Leigh, 2006; Weaver, 2006). Alesina and Ferrara (2002) found that the circumstances most likely to lead to a reduction of generalized trust in others included exposure to trauma, membership in a minority group that has been discriminated against, and low educational attainment and income levels. Of racial groups, numerous studies have found that Blacks express the least amount of generalized trust (Alesina & Ferrara, 2002; Glaeser, Laibson, Scheinkman & Soutter, 2000; Franzini, 2008; Putnam, 2000a; Smith, 2010; Taylor, Funk & Clark, 2007; Uslaner, 2002).

Length of time in a neighborhood and characteristics of a community can also influence levels of trust. Alesina and Ferrara (2002) found that the perceived stability of a neighborhood and resident transiency in a community influenced individual residents' inclination to trust. Neighborhood instability, concentrated disadvantage, and low levels of civic participation have been found to hinder social trust (Putnam, 2007; Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997). Collective efficacy has been described as the willingness of community members to intervene to promote the common good of a community when there is a threat to the social order, and this process relies on a high level of mutual trust among neighborhood residents (Franzini, 2008; Sampson et. Al, 1997). Social order, social control and collective efficacy are contextual mechanisms known to positively impact trust (Bakker & Dekker, 2012; Sampson et al., 1997). In

2011, Bakker and Dekker found that physical order of a neighborhood was also strongly related to levels of social trust.

Trust and mistrust have been studied in depth with regards to the relationship of this concept with social capital and neighborhood disadvantage. In 2008, Pyles and Cross examined social capital (operationalized as civic engagement and social trust) as it relates to community revitalization in a post-Katrina New Orleans neighborhood. The study subjects were residents of this post-Katrina neighborhood, primarily African American. In July of 2006, the researchers conducted two focus groups with 11 neighborhood residents, and coded transcripts to identify themes to inform the development of constructs for the survey instrument. The Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form was adapted for the survey. A snowball sampling method (Goodman, 1961) was used as many residents remained displaced from Katrina, and the researchers preferred method – a randomized neighborhood level cluster sample – was not a viable option. Only people who self-reported as neighborhood members were surveyed (Pyles & Cross, 2008).

A face-to-face survey was administered at public locations in the neighborhood and collected information on the residents' individual civic engagement activities and perceptions of community trust from 153 individuals. Political participation (being registered to vote, having voted in the latest election, participation in political meetings/rallies), civic associational involvement (participation in neighborhood meetings, school parent/teacher related events and groups, and cultural activities), faith-based engagement (attending church or religious activities other than services), social and inter-racial trust (perceptions of the level of trust among neighbors, with police, and other races), and well-being were the primary indicators used to capture levels of social capital. The data were collected over a two-month period in early fall of

2006. The researchers used social capital theory and critical theory as the lens through which to interpret their findings. Descriptive statistics, chi-squares and correlational analyses were used to answer the research questions (Pyles & Cross, 2008).

Pyles and Cross (2008) found significant correlations between the measures of well-being, happiness and health, and that higher police trust and racial trust scores were associated with higher scores for health. They also found the older the residents were, the more likely they were to participate in elections, and the younger respondents were more likely to participate in cultural events, and those with higher income levels reported higher levels of participation overall in civic engagement activities. Pyles and Cross created the social capital variable by summing scores from civic engagement and trust indicators and used nonparametric correlations (Spearman Rho) to examine relationships between social capital and well-being and demographic variables. They found no significant relationships among these, however (Pyles & Cross, 2008).

Overall high levels of civic engagement were found through this study, and Pyles and Cross (2008) suggested this was most likely due to the widespread elevation of civic participation in the post-Katrina environment, and commonly reported in post-disaster/disaster recovery research. They also found that those with lesser income were less likely to be able to participate in civic engagement activities. Regarding trust, Pyles and Cross (2008) found that 70% of respondents reported they "did not" or "only slightly" trust their neighbors, 52% did not trust police, and 84% did not trust people of other races. The authors point out that this finding is unique and counter-intuitive; whereas this community reported remarkably high levels of civic engagement, they also reported comparatively low levels of trust. This finding contradicts Putnam's theory of social capital, which asserts that civic engagement and trust are commonly

correlated variables. Their findings confirm another of Putnam's assertions, however, in the positive association between reported levels of trust and perceptions of health (Pyles & Cross, 2008). Pyles and Cross (2008) discuss the importance of trust similarly to Putnam (2000), as the "central facet" of social capital, and how social capital is built over time due to the mutual benefit that is derived from trusting relationships. In their conclusion, Pyles and Cross (2008) caution that building social capital is not the sole solution to community revitalization, that it may be one component of neighborhood transformation, but also policies, the political climate, and organizational capacity building are equally important to addressing poverty and inequality.

In a study of residents across a variety of neighborhood compositions in Birmingham, Alabama, Usher (2007) found that generalized trust (trust in most people) was an important predictor of happiness; specifically, that higher levels of generalized trust were positively associated with higher levels of physical and mental well-being. Of note, particularized trust (bonding – trust in neighbors) was not found to have a significant effect on well-being. Usher (2007, p. 385) described trust as "the cornerstone of social capital," and concluded that high levels of generalized trust are related to a higher quality of life. Usher recommended that community development begin with assessing levels of trust in a neighborhood and developing strategies to build trust within and among residents to promote healthy communities.

There is little research to understand the determinants of trust and how generalized trust is cultivated in a community (Franzini, 2008; Marschall & Stolle, 2004). Many researchers have sought to understand the collective culture of trust by investigating attitudes of generalized trust regarding the trustworthiness of social systems and institutions in a specific community. In one cross-country study of seven European and Western countries, higher levels of trust were found to be associated among people with higher perceptions of public safety. Additionally, the

researchers found that higher perceptions of well-being and personal success were associated with a greater inclination toward generalized trust, and conversely, higher levels of anxiety, lower perceptions of well-being and success were related to greater levels of generalized distrust (Delhey & Newton, 2003).

Understanding the predictors of trust in disadvantaged neighborhoods is important as trust has been found to be associated with health outcomes, and disadvantaged neighborhoods tend to be besieged with poor health outcomes. In 2008, Franzini investigated individual-level and neighborhood-level determinants of general trust in 98 low-income, minority neighborhoods in Texas using census and survey data. This study found that the ability to communicate through shared language was a greater predictor of general trust than racial/ethnic homogeneity. Additionally, this study determined that people were more inclined to have higher levels of particularized trust with their neighbors – people who lived nearby and with whom they had a personal relationship. The researcher concluded that by increasing integration in diverse communities, higher levels of trust could be built, resulting in increasing overall positive health outcomes for neighborhood residents (Franzini, 2008).

Understanding social capital, relationships and trust requires an understanding of the socio-demographic characteristics of individuals and groups as it relates to social interactions, attitudes and perceptions of generalized trust in their situational context (Marschall & Stolle, 2004). In a study of neighborhoods in Detroit, using the Detroit Area Study surveys and census tract data, Marschall and Stolle (2004) found that true to previous studies, generalized trust levels for Whites were lower as associated with educational attainment and neighborhood disorder; however, for Blacks, this study revealed that living in neighborhoods with a high density of social interaction was a strong predictor of generalized trust. Based on their findings, the

researchers recommend that strategies to develop trust should be different for different races. Strategies to build generalized trust among Blacks in the context of neighborhoods should include opportunities for close social interactions with people from a broader range of backgrounds representing a higher degree of diversity (Marschall & Stolle, 2004).

Summary

Pervasive poverty continues to plague urban communities throughout the US, and people living in disinvested, low-wealth communities experience elevated rates of crime, lower standards of living, and poorer health outcomes. Oftentimes people living in these marginalized communities lack access to basic public goods and neighborhood amenities that promote quality of life and well-being, including quality education from cradle to career, affordable and decent housing, fresh produce and healthy foods, parks and recreation facilities, preventative health care, and jobs with live-able wages. In order for a civic economy to thrive, local public, private, educational, and philanthropic sectors must align their resources and investments with engaged and active citizens sharing power in decision-making about community well-being.

Anti-poverty policies have evolved in recent decades to promote the aligning and leveraging of cross-sector investments and collaboration at the federal and local levels, and community development initiatives that integrate people- and place-based strategies for holistic, multi-faceted transformation based on the unique needs and assets of local communities holds the greatest promise for sustainable success. Using the tenets of consensus organizing, community developers can improve the social determinants of health for low-wealth neighborhoods by engaging residents as experts about their own communities, empowering residents as decision-makers, facilitating the discovery of areas of mutual self-interest between

residents and outside investors, and building consensus around a comprehensive vision for neighborhood improvements.

Building the capacity of individuals, networks and organizations in order to support healthy communities and thriving civic economies requires the concurrent development of economic, human, physical and social capital. The creation and mobilization of social capital can not only lead to economic development, but can also facilitate opportunities for human capital gains through expanding networks and improvements in the physical capital through collective action for changes in the built environment. A deeper understanding of social capital, and particularly the presence or absence of trust in impoverished urban communities, is a worthwhile endeavor in order to gain insight into the impact of holistic, place-based initiatives such as Choice Neighborhoods.

Understanding the prospect of developing and sustaining trust in low-wealth communities begins with an exploration of perceptions of generalized trust in a community targeted for a Choice Neighborhood intervention, and how those perceptions are related to other dimensions of social capital including reciprocal relationships, neighborhood cohesion and civic engagement, and whether or not these dimensions are related to readiness for transformation. As access to social programs, services and basic standards of living are determinants of health outcomes for people in the neighborhoods where they live, further research to understand residents' perceptions of access as it relates to their belief in their own ability to contribute to the civic economy by making changes in their neighborhood and subsequently their own lives is necessary, in order to inform strategies for community organizing and engagement. Through expanding the literature pertaining to the impact of collaboration and civic engagement concerning the density of social networks, reciprocal relationships and social trust in the context

of place-based initiatives, the effectiveness of strategies to cultivate trust and facilitate collective action for community transformation can be further understood.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

Chapter three introduces the research design and methodology for the study of the civic economy, social capital, demographic attributes, and openness to transformation in the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative. The purpose and context of the study are explained, followed by research questions and hypotheses, operational definition of key variables, characteristics of the population and sample, and data collection and instrumentation. At the end of this chapter data analyses methods for the research questions are presented.

Research Purpose

This exploratory research examined the relationships between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital, and the connections of these relationships to openness to transformation. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of trust among residents affected by the Choice Neighborhoods Planning initiative in Shreveport, Louisiana. The objectives of this study aim to understand the civic economy of the neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights. This includes an understanding of the perceived social capital: trust, reciprocal relationships, social cohesion, social ties and civic engagement of neighborhood residents.

Research Context

This study was conducted as part of a larger neighborhood transformation planning project in Shreveport, Louisiana – the HUD-funded Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative. The study and overall project used a community-engaged approach, which involved the collaboration with and inclusion of residents, community leaders, and other partners in the design and execution of the project. Research questions, measures, and methods of data

collection were discussed and agreed upon in conversations between community leadership, which included residents from the target neighborhood, and the researcher. While conducting collaborative community research can serve to strengthen the quality of the study and help to build the capacity of the community, there are certain comprises that are made with regard to research rigor (Anderson-Butcher, Iachini, Ball, Barker, & Martin, 2015). However these comprises were considered to outweigh the costs, in terms of the access the researcher was provided to the community, the gains in the value of the study's findings for the residents and partners, and the opportunity to enhance the capacity of residents and other community leaders through the project by using a community-engaged study design and delivery approach,.

Research Questions

The following research questions were designed in order to further understand the relationship between neighborhood planning, resident engagement and social capital, and the influence of these relationships on residents' readiness for the transformation:

Q1: What are the residents' perceptions of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?

Q2: Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as marital status, age group, educational level, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?

Q3: Are residents' perceptions of social capital and trust related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?

Q4: Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they could contribute to improve their civic economy?

Q5: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents? [To what extent do residents report relatively higher levels of social capital one year after the initiation of the Choice Neighborhood planning process?]

Q6: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?

Research Hypotheses

Q1: What are the residents' perceptions of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?

As this research question was answered using qualitative inquiry, no hypotheses were needed.

Q2: Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as marital status, age group, educational level, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?

H1: Trust, Civic Engagement, Social Cohesion, Social Ties and Reciprocal Relationships are positively correlated.

H2: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Trust.

H3: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Civic Engagement.

H4: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Social Cohesion.

H5: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Social Ties.

H6: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Reciprocal Relationships.

Q3: Are residents' perceptions of social capital and trust related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?

H1: Levels of social capital (social trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, social ties and reciprocal relationships) are positive predictors of openness to neighborhood transformation.

Q4: Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they could contribute to their civic economy?

H1: Residents who report high satisfaction with access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities are more likely to believe they can contribute to their civic economy.

Q5: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents? *[To what extent do residents report relatively higher levels of social capital one year after the initiation of the Choice Neighborhood planning process?]*

H1: Levels of social capital (trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, social ties and reciprocal relationships) will be higher one year into the Choice Neighborhood planning process (Time 2 Survey) than reported at baseline (Time 1 Survey).

Q6: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?

H1: Gains in civic engagement and collaboration are positively associated with higher levels of trust, social cohesion, social ties, and reciprocal relationships, and total social capital.

Methods and Procedures

Research Design and Procedures

To explore these research questions and hypotheses, a mixed-methods design integrating quantitative and qualitative methods was employed (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Data was collected and analyzed through focus groups, a content analysis, and one-group pre-planning in 2012 (Time 1 Survey) and one-year post-planning initiation in 2013 (Time 2 Survey) surveys, utilizing within-group analyses to examine variations among resident perceptions in relation to resident attributes. At the start of the project, three focus groups were conducted with neighborhood residents in the initial stages of data collection and prior to the development of the survey instrument. The purpose of the focus groups was to capture the discussion of the residents' vision for a revitalized neighborhood, to identify the perceived assets and barriers to achieving that vision, and to understand community trust, engagement, and other related themes. During the focus groups, concepts related to the civic economy and dimensions of social capital were discussed, current and ideal perceptions of the civic economy and systems of social trust were explored, and openness and/or skepticism of (and reasons therein) the Choice Neighborhood transformation initiative were considered.

Early research procedures also consisted of a content analysis of the 2007 Allendale ONE Plan and Appendix documents, in order to obtain baseline data on the levels of social capital, openness to transformation, and perceptions of the civic economy. The Allendale ONE plan was a part of the “TOTAL” Commitment Neighborhood Transformation initiative to holistically renew inner city Shreveport neighborhoods, funded by the City of Shreveport. Launched in 2004 by a local planning firm, MHSM Architects, this planning effort focused on understanding the history, challenges, opportunities, and priorities for renewal in the Allendale community. The

planning effort emphasized a "People First" approach, soliciting input from neighborhood residents and stakeholders through meetings, retreats and charettes throughout the process. The Allendale ONE Appendix document included planning notes and resident quotes from the community resident and stakeholder conversations (Mitchell, 2007).

The findings from these qualitative analyses were used to inform the development of the community assessment survey instrument, which was devised and finalized in collaboration with community leadership, residents and the researcher. The survey instrument included adapted versions of scales containing social capital constructs measuring trust, social ties, and civic engagement from the *Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form* (Putnam, 2002), measuring social cohesion as originally used in the *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods* (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997), and measuring reciprocal relationships as originally used in the *National Survey of Black Americans* (Jackson & Neighbors, 1997), later adapted for use in the *Making Connections Initiative* (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2013). Previous research has set a precedent for using adapted scales of various social capital constructs (Brisson & Usher, 2007; Pyles & Cross, 2008) and as social capital has been considered a complex construct with differing and sometimes overlapping approaches to measurement (Forrest & Kearns, 2001; Harpham, 2008; Lochner, Kawachi, & Kennedy, 1999; Putnam, 2001), one advantage of small-scale studies is the ability to investigate multiple facets of social capital in a comprehensive approach (Harpham, Grant, & Thomas, 2002). Questions selected for inclusion in the survey were agreed upon through conversations with community leaders, residents and the researcher. Questions ascertained both cognitive social capital (perceptions of values and beliefs) and structured social capital (perceptions of behaviors) (Harpham, 2008).

In addition to other various situational assessment measures, the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights community analysis survey included subscales which examined five dimensions of social capital, including social trust, civic engagement, social ties, reciprocal relationships, social cohesion, and related measures of perceptions of the civic economy and individual well-being, access to neighborhood amenities, and openness to neighborhood transformation. The Time 1 Survey was collected at the start of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative in 2012, and Time 2 Survey was collected one year after the initiation of the planning initiative in 2013. The data collection plans for the original survey research included both phone and household level surveying approaches. The unit of analysis was head of households in the neighborhoods of Allendale/Ledbetter Heights. At the time of this study, of the 5060 residents in Allendale/Ledbetter Heights, 44.7% were living in poverty, 95.3% were minority (93% Black), and only 10.4% had obtained an associate's degree or higher (US Census, 2013). The telephone survey was planned to utilize random digit dialing for head of households in the targeted neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights, followed by a face-to-face household level survey approach utilizing a random, multi-stage cluster sampling of the target population based on census tracts. Because of the markedly high rates of low educational attainment, the telephone and face-to-face survey interview approaches were planned rather than mass mailing, to circumvent potential literacy issues.

However, due to limitations in accessing phone numbers linked to neighborhood specific addresses, and the discovery through conversations with residents that most households did not subscribe to landline telephone service, the phone survey was unsuccessful. As a result, the face-to-face household level survey sampling approach was adjusted to a census approach, whereas every household that was deemed to be occupied in the neighborhoods of Allendale and

Ledbetter Heights were approached multiple times on various times and days of the week in order to yield the highest return rate possible. Additionally, for those who were unable to complete it at the time their residence was visited by the research team, residents were offered the option of telephone interviews or to complete the survey independently and return by mail.

Following this initial data collection process, the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood Planning Team initiated the Choice Neighborhood planning activities geared toward resident engagement for transformation planning. These activities included collaborative action planning, the establishment of a Neighborhood Transformation Steering Committee, monthly public meetings, interviewing, visioning and listening sessions, and design charrettes for the Choice Neighborhood implementation design. The researcher served as a member of the core leadership team for the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood initiative throughout the duration of the planning process, and in this capacity was also responsible for gathering data regarding the "People" section of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood Transformation Plan. In this capacity, the researcher facilitated numerous additional listening and visioning sessions with residents and a cross-sector of community partners and stakeholders, which included nonprofit executives, government officials, philanthropic entities, business owners, educators and elected officials. Through monthly visioning and listening sessions over the course of the implementation grant, the researcher facilitated the articulation and prioritization of strategies and outcomes pertaining to "People" goals, including health and wellness, education, public safety, arts, culture and recreation, and workforce development. These priorities and strategies were written into a formal plan by the researcher in 2013, under guidance from residents and community stakeholders.

The Time 2 Survey took place one year after the baseline measurement (Time 1 Survey), and the research activities replicated the design utilized in the Time 1 Survey, targeted the

completed sample of original survey participants. The *completed sample* refers to all head of households that completed the original questionnaire (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009).

Table 1. Timing of Variables Used in this Analysis

CONSTRUCT	MEASURE	Time 1 (Spring 2012)	Time 2 (Spring 2013)
Perceptions of Social Trust	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form (adapted version)	X	X
Perceptions of Civic Engagement (Civic leadership, political participation, associational involvement, volunteering)	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form (adapted version)	X	X
Perceptions of Social Cohesion	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	Social Cohesion Scale – Sampson et. al, 1997 (adapted version)	X	X
Perceptions of Social Ties	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	

(Table 1 continued)

CONSTRUCT	MEASURE	Time 1 (Spring 2012)	Time 2 (Spring 2013)
Perceptions of Social Ties (cont'd)	Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form (adapted version)	X	X
Perceptions of Reciprocal Relationships	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	National Survey of Black Americans/ Making Connections Survey (adapted version)	X	X
Openness to Transformation	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale One Plan & Appendix	X	
	Community Survey	X	X
Access to Health Care, Education, and/or Housing Opportunities	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	Community Survey	X	X
Socio-Demographic Attributes	Community Survey	X	X
Contribution to Civic Economy	Focus group transcripts	X	
	Allendale ONE Plan & Appendix	X	
	Community Survey	X	X

This research was carefully designed in order to respond most appropriately to the target population's capacity for participation through the use of appropriate methodology, in order to obtain the data and information to most effectively answer the proposed research questions.

Participants and Sample

The focus group method employed a purposeful sampling technique (Creswell, 2007) in order to achieve a cross-section of demographic variables that most closely reflected the larger neighborhood population. Focus groups were held in a neighborhood school and a centrally located community center. Of the three focus groups held in 2012, a total of 24 residents participated: nine in focus group one, seven in focus group two, and eight in focus group three. Participants ranged in age from 33 years to 76 years old, and 14 identified as female and 10 identified as male. All participants identified as Black or African American.

Participants in the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys included heads of households from occupied residences located in the target Choice Neighborhood. The sample population included the total number of households in the combined neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights, which in 2011 was 1,191, with 175 of those classified as unoccupied, considered to be an underestimated account of all vacant households by city leadership (Wise, 2012). A minimum of 100 completed surveys is generally regarded as the minimum for achieving adequate statistical power for analysis, and fewer completed surveys are necessary for a relatively demographically homogenous population (Andranovich & Howell, 2005). Accounting for the households documented as unoccupied, the sample population consisted of 1,016 households. Of the 1,016 households deemed occupied in the neighborhood by the city, surveyors identified an additional 135 households as vacant or unsafe, bringing the final sample population down to 881.

Surveyors were recruited from the neighborhood and from local universities. Residents and students who surveyed received specialized training and were compensated for their time. Due to limitations in funding, no incentives were provided to households that completed the surveys for Time 1 or Time 2. At least three attempts were made at households where no one answered, and surveyors were instructed to leave flyers at the homes with information about the initiative and the research study. After the third attempt a survey packet was mailed to the home, which included a letter, instructions and information, and the survey with a pre-paid return envelope (See Appendix F for Survey Training Materials).

For the Time 1 Survey, surveyors canvassed the neighborhoods over a period of three months in the early Spring of 2012, and 236 head of households completed the survey, while 156 (17.7%) households refused to participate, for a completion rate of 26.8%. For the Time 2 Survey, the sample consisted of 163 households, as 73 households of the original 236 completed sample were not linked to specific addresses. A total of 59 post-surveys were completed from the 163 available households, for a completion rate of 36.2%. Surveyors noted that 38 (23.3%) of the 163 households were either vacant or they were informed that the original participants had moved since the Time 1 Survey, and 12 (7.4%) households refused to participate in the follow-up survey. The 54 remaining households were deemed unreachable, after two attempts had been made on various days and times over a series of four weeks.

Research Instrumentation

The instrumentation developed for use in this study was created in collaboration with residents, community leadership and the researcher, in the context of a larger community assessment for the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative. Using findings from the focus groups, the researcher worked closely with the collaborative team to determine which

social capital constructs to examine. The researcher presented the collaborative team with various measures for social capital, and the team determined which questions were best suited for this study. Considerations for the inclusion or exclusion of social capital constructs from prior measures was determined based on what was deemed to be most relevant to community concerns, what was considered appropriate in the cultural context, whether there appeared to be redundant constructs, and what was the most economical use of survey space.

The Time 1 Survey and Time 2 Survey for this study contained identical questions, but the Time 2 Survey was a shortened version of the Time 1 Survey, containing only access, social capital and demographic question categories. The Time 1 Survey was part of a larger community situational assessment effort to capture information in a variety of transformation outcome areas (e.g. health and well-being, child care and early education, education, adult education and jobs, and crime and safety). Social capital subscales concerned with social trust, social ties, and civic engagement were selected from an adapted version of the *Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey* (short-form) developed out of the Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America in 2000, at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government (Putnam, 2002b). This instrument was adapted to focus on the inclusion of select questions related to social trust, social ties, and civic engagement into the larger needs assessment survey instrument developed specifically for the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood. The *Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey* is recommended for optimal use as a pre and post measurement to document social capital changes in places across time (Putnam, 2002b). A subscale containing four questions examining reciprocal relationships was used from the *National Survey of Black Americans* (Jackson & Neighbors, 1997), which was used more recently in the national *Making Connections Initiative* (Annie E. Casey, 2013). To measure social cohesion, three questions were

selected from a scale used to measure collective efficacy – concerning social cohesion and social control – originally used in the *Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods* (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). See Appendices G-I for the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys.

Issues of Validity and Reliability

Measurement Reliability and Validity

Focus Groups. For the focus groups, the following six queries were created to guide the semi-structured discussion: (1) When you think of your neighborhood, how would you describe it?; (2) What are the things that currently make you proud of your neighborhood?; (3) What is missing in your neighborhood that could make a difference – make your life better?; (4) How do you feel about a process to come up with a plan to make improvements in your neighborhood?; (5) When you think about services in the neighborhood (such as health care, education, business and retail, job opportunities, other) do you feel these are readily available and you can access them? Why or why not?; and (6) When you think about the word "trust," what does it mean to you? How do you define it? Whom do you trust in and outside of your neighborhood? Whom do you not trust?. See Appendices A-C for Focus Group Guidelines and related documents.

Time 1 and Time 2 Surveys. The *Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey* (Putnam, 2000b) is an instrument that is widely used to study social capital. The *Social Capital Community Benchmark* was originally conducted as a national telephone survey from July to November of 2000 with over 26,000 respondents in 29 states. It has been described as "unparalleled in the richness and breadth of social capital measures" (Messner, Baumer, & Rosenfeld, 2011; p. 886).

In constructing the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form, researchers considered the test-retest reliability with regards to the consistency of responses from

the original 2000 survey effort and two 2002 waves of the survey, and selected the "most stable social capital questions…and those most central to the various dimensions of social capital" (Sander & Lowney, 2006; p.8; Putnam, 2002b). The Short Form survey was developed with three purposes in mind: a) to encourage further survey effort on social capital by government entities; b) to provide a more cost-effective survey for smaller communities; and c) and to provide a shortened version with questions that could be added to other survey efforts (Putnam, 2002b). To determine which questions to include in the Short Form, a factor analysis was conducted to identify questions with high loadings in the dominant and second most important factors comprising the various dimensions (Putnam, 2002b). Items included in the short form were those that were most highly loaded on the key dimensions and ones with strong test-retest reliability (T. Sander, personal communication, May 4, 2015). Reliability was not considered to be a great threat to the design of this study as consistency to the methods was used; the same set of questions was used in both Time 1 and Time 2 measurements. All surveyors participated in a structured training, and additionally, the same participants were targeted for both Time 1 and Time 2 surveying.

Design Validity

External validity provides the researcher with confidence that findings are generalizable beyond the participants and conditions related to this specific study (Rubin & Babbie, 2008; Yegidis & Weinbach, 2002). Since this study was conducted with a small sample in a neighborhood in Shreveport, Louisiana, broad generalizability is not considered to be a major strength of this research. Communities vary significantly in demographic character, geography and culture, and therefore these findings are not considered to be highly generalizable or applicable outside of the geographic parameters of the research. However, as many inner city,

impoverished communities share common traits with regards to elevated rates of poverty, instances of crime, concentrated minority populations, disinvestment, low educational attainment and high unemployment, the findings of this study will have relevance for other communities and neighborhoods in similar circumstances.

Operationalization of Study Variables

Dimensions of Social Capital and Other Key Variables

The social capital variables for this study included five primary dimensions of social capital: (1) social trust; (2) civic engagement; (3) social cohesion; (4) social ties; and (5) reciprocal relationships. Items in discrete categories of the dimensions of social capital were averaged to create total scores for: (1) Total Trust; (2) Total Civic Engagement; (3) Total Social Cohesion; (4) Total Social Ties; and (5) Total Reciprocal Relationships. An overall Total Social Capital score was created for individual respondents by calculating the mean for the five social capital dimension total scores. The formula for scoring total social capital was based on similar methods utilized in previous research (see Pyles & Cross, 2008).

Based on the focus group findings and resident input in the survey design, Openness to Transformation was operationalized as optimism about the future of the neighborhood (over the next five years, will your neighborhood change for the better, stay the same, change for the worse?). Civic Economy was operationalized as belief in one's ability to improve or make decisions that impact the neighborhood, and collaboration was operationalized as whether or not residents had worked with others in their neighborhood to make improvements. The specific constructs for the social capital and other key variables are included in Table 2, and the full questions can be reviewed in the Time 1 survey in Appendix G.

Table 2. Constructs for Social Capital and Other Key Variables

Dimension of Social Capital and other Key Constructs	Item (Question Number)	Coding
Trust	Trust neighbors (Q36a) Trust local police (Q36b) Trust local government (Q36c)	0=Not at all; 1=A little; 2=Some; 3=A lot
Civic Engagement	Volunteered/helped community activities (Q41a) Attended public meeting (Q41b) Interest in local politics (Q41h)	0=Never; 1=Once or twice; 2=Once a month; 3= Once a week or more
	Served as an officer (Q42) Talked to political official about neighborhood (Q44a)	0=No; 3=Yes*
Social Cohesion	Connectedness to neighbors (Q34)	0=Not close at all; 1=Somewhat close; 2=Close; 3=Very close
	Close-knit neighborhood (Q35a) People get along (Q35c)	0=Strongly disagree; 1=Disagree; 2=Agree; 3=Strongly agree
Reciprocal Relationships	Willingness to help neighbors (Q35b)	0=Strongly disagree; 1=Disagree; 2=Agree; 3=Strongly agree

(Table 2 continued)

Dimension of Social Capital and other Key Constructs	Item (Question Number)	Coding
Reciprocal Relationships (cont'd)	Getting help or support - family (Q36d) Giving help or support – family (Q38a) Getting help or support – friends (Q38b) Giving help or support – friends (Q40)	0=Not at all; 1=A little; 2=Some; 3=A lot
Social Ties	Had friends to home (Q41c) Different race in home/at home (Q41d) Different neighborhood in home/at home (Q41e) Community leader in home/at home (Q41f)	0=Never; 1=Once or twice; 2=Once a month; 3=Once a week or more
Openness to transformation (Optimism for transformation)	Neighborhood change in next five years (Q46)	0=Change for the worse; 1=Stay the same; 2=Change for the better
Civic Economy	Ability to improve or make decisions (Q47b)	0=No; 1=Yes
Collaboration	Worked with neighbors to organize improvements (Q44c)	0=No; 1=Yes

Note. See Appendices G-I for Time 1 and Time 2 surveys.
*Two civic engagement questions were coded to carry equal weight with the other three questions for calculating the Total Civic Engagement Score.

Demographic Variables

Nominal variables consisted of the following socio-demographic characteristics: of gender (female/male), marital status (single/have a partner/ married/ widowed/ divorced/ separated), race and ethnicity (white/ black or African American/ Hispanic, Latino or Spanish

origin/ other), and homeowner status (own/ rent), self-reported by the participants. Ordinal attributes included educational attainment (less than high school/ regular high school diploma/ GED or alternative credential/ some college, 2 or 4 year university or college/ associate degree/ college degree/ more than a college degree), and income level (less than $15,000; between $15,001 and $25,000; between $25,001 and $50,000; more than $50,000).

The constructs of age (by year of birth) and length of time in the neighborhood were measured at the ratio level. All socio-demographic variables were self-reported through the survey questionnaire and participants were given the option of "I do not want to answer."

Data Collection Procedures

In order to ensure accessibility, the focus groups were held in two locations: a neighborhood school and a community center located within a multi-family housing complex centrally located in the Choice Neighborhood area. Participants were recruited through word of mouth and fliers posted in civic centers, churches, convenience stores, and housing complexes in the neighborhood. The focus groups met for approximately an hour and a half each, and the rooms were set up with the chairs situated in a large circle with a table in the center. Participants were provided refreshments, notepads for their own personal use, given information about the purpose of the research and the initiative, and informed consent was read aloud in the room and signatures obtained prior to launching into the discussion. Participants completed a one-page short questionnaire as they arrived to gather early data on priority issues in the neighborhood. The session was recorded with a cassette player and digital recorder for back up.

The Time 1 Survey was administered through in-person interviews at residents' households throughout the neighborhood. Prior to surveying, fliers were placed throughout the neighborhood to inform residents of the upcoming survey effort. Residents from the

neighborhood and students from Louisiana State University-Shreveport and Southern University at Shreveport were recruited, trained and received hourly compensation to conduct the household level survey interviews, which launched in early spring on 2012. Surveyors approached every occupied house in the Choice neighborhood area and provided each potential participant with a letter explaining the purpose of the research and a flier containing information about the broader Choice Neighborhood initiative. Each house was approached a total of three times (on different days and at varying hours) over the span of a few weeks, with "sorry we missed you" fliers left at homes where no one answered. On the third and final attempt, a copy of the survey was left at the door with a return envelope including pre-paid postage. In addition to the mailer option, in the letter left at each home with the survey, residents were provided with a phone number to call in order to arrange for a survey interview over the telephone, and a web address with a link to the digitized version of the survey. Potential participants were informed their participation was voluntary, and surveyors shared documents including informed consent, and residents were told about their rights regarding confidentiality and the right to refuse participation or opt out of the study at any time.

For the Time 2 Survey, only those households having participated in the Time 1 Survey were approached for follow-up. One year after the Time 1 Survey was administered, in the spring of 2013, the Time 2 Survey was administered in a similar manner as the Time 1 Survey. Residents and students of Louisiana State University in Shreveport and Southern University at Shreveport were recruited, trained and compensated to serve as surveyors, and addresses from 2012 survey completers were targeted for participation. Of the Time 1 Surveys, 73 were missing links to addresses, limiting the pool of potential residents for follow-up to 163. Of the 163, 54 households did not answer during the follow-up survey period, 12 households answered but

declined to participate, and in 38 households the original residents no longer resided there. Information on confidentiality, voluntary participation, right to refuse and the option to elect out of participation at any time during the process was once again shared with potential participants. Approval for the study was obtained through the Louisiana State University Institutional Review Board (#3195) in the interest of protection for human subjects participating in research prior to initiating the research. See Appendix E for the IRB approval documents.

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis of the surveys consisted of parametric and nonparametric methods, including descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. A t-test for dependent samples was used to measure the differences in the dimensions of social capital between the Time 1 and Time 2 measurements. Multivariate statistical methods (multiple regression, logistic regression) were used to examine relationships between social capital and other key variables of interest.

For the first research question, a qualitative analysis was employed. Three focus groups were held, audio-recorded and field notes were taken. Additionally, a content analysis uncovered related themes and patterns from the 2006 Allendale ONE planning assessment and appendix. Focus group dialogue data was transcribed, coded, and analyzed to identify key themes and patterns. This assessment was conducted as a beginning step in a targeted area of the Allendale neighborhood to gain information from residents to inform the initial strategy to implement a holistic revitalization effort in the community. The qualitative analysis reviewed transcripts from the focus groups and the Allendale ONE plan and appendices and identified significant statements and clustered themes using Moustakas' (1994) structured empirical approach to phenomenology. Content was examined to identify predetermined and emerging themes related to the dimensions of social capital and community readiness. These steps included bracketing

and reduction, delineating units of meaning, clustering units to form themes, and extracting general and unique themes. The researcher examined the lived experiences of trust and community, focusing on description of the collective experiences rather than interpretation of individual views (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). The primary 'phenomena' was trust, along with social capital, openness to transformation, access to resources, and the civic economy. Data from the focus group transcripts and the Allendale ONE plan was uploaded into NVivo10, open coding was used to create nodes, followed by the analysis of nodes, which were collapsed and expanded as appropriate to create themes. Data from the documents were reduced into significant statements, combined into themes, then transformed into formulated meanings to uncover the essence of the lived experiences for themed clusters through combining the textural and structural descriptions (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). Additionally, the researcher used a constant comparative approach in the open coding phase to achieve saturation, reviewing all content until no new insights were uncovered (Creswell, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

Bivariate analyses were used to examine associations among the five dimensions of social capital for the second research question. Additionally, five OLS multiple regression models were calculated to examine relationships among predictor variables - demographic attributes (e.g., age, marital status, homeowner status) and outcome variables – the total scores of social capital dimensions (trust, social cohesion, reciprocal relationships, civic engagement and social ties). The third research question was analyzed using binomial logistic regression. In this logistic regression analysis, openness to transformation was considered as a binary outcome variable. The five primary dimensions of social capital (total trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, social ties and reciprocal relationships) were considered predictor variables.

The fourth research question was first examined using bivariate analyses with Chi-Square. Next, logistic regression was used, testing multivariate analyses that included select demographic variables. The variables perceived access to health care, education, social services, and housing opportunities were used as predictors of ability to contribute to the civic economy, coded as a binary variable. The fifth research question examined differences in mean scores across Time 1 and Time 2. Paired-Sample T-tests comparing Time 1 and Time 2 measures of the dimensions of social capital (total trust, total reciprocal relationships, total social cohesion, total social ties, and total civic engagement) were used to investigate variations in social capital after the Choice Neighborhood planning process. For the sixth and final research question, residualized gain scores were created using Time 1 and Time 2 experiences of civic engagement and collaboration. Residualized gain scores are the difference between each survey participants' predicted Time 2 score and their actual Time 2 score, as relative to the group change. Bivariate analyses were used to examine associations with civic engagement, collaboration, and Time 2 total trust, total social cohesion, total social ties and total reciprocal relationships. Collaboration was further examined with total civic engagement and total social capital.

Table 3. Research Questions, Hypotheses, Analyses and Levels of Measurement

Research Question	Hypotheses	Type of Analysis	Level of Measurement
Q1. What are the residents' perceptions of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?	Not applicable.	(a) Empirical Phenomenological inquiry	Not applicable. Data Source: Allendale ONE Plan and Focus Group Transcripts

(Table 3 continued)

Research Question	Hypotheses	Type of Analysis	Level of Measurement
Q2. Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as marital status, age group, educational level, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?	H1: Trust, Civic Engagement, Social Cohesion, Social Ties and Reciprocal Relationships are positively correlated. H2-H6: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Total Trust (H2), Total Civic Engagement (H3), Total Social Cohesion (H4), Total Social Ties (H5), Total Reciprocal Relationships (H6)	H1: Bivariate analyses (Pearson's r) H2: OLS – Five separate regression models	Outcome Variables: (a) Total Trust Score = Ratio (b) Total Civic Engagement Score = Ratio (c) Total Social Cohesion = Ratio (d) Total Reciprocal Relationships = Ratio (e) Total Social Ties Score = Ratio Predictor Variables: (a) Marital status = Nominal (b) Homeowner status = Nominal (c) Education Level = Ordinal (d) Age = Ratio (e) Length of time in neighborhood = Ratio/Ordinal
Q3. Are residents' perceptions of social capital and trust related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?	H1: Levels of social capital (social trust, civic engagement, neighborhood cohesion, and reciprocal relationships) are positive predictors of the degree of openness to neighborhood transformation.	Binomial Logistic Regression	Predictor Variables: (a) Total Trust = Ratio (b) Total Civic Engagement = Ratio (c) Total Social Cohesion = Ratio (d) Total Reciprocal Relationships = Ratio (e) Total Social Ties = Ratio Outcome Variable: Openness to Transformation = Dichotomous

(Table 3 continued)

Research Question	Hypotheses	Type of Analysis	Level of Measurement
Q4. Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they can contribute to improve their civic economy?	H1: Residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities are more likely to believe they can contribute to their civic economy.	Chi Square	Predictor Variables: (a) Health Care = Categorical (b) Education = Categorical (c) Housing/ Affordable = Categorical (d) Housing/Quality = Categorical Outcome Variable: Civic Economy = Binary
Q5: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents? [To what extent do residents report relatively higher levels of social capital one year after the initiation of the Choice Neighborhood planning process?]	H1: Levels of social capital will be higher in the post-test than at baseline.	Paired Samples T-test	(a) Time 1 Total Social Capital Score (Ratio) and five total dimensions of social capital (Ratio) (b) Time 2 Total Social Capital Score (Ratio) and five total dimensions of social capital (Ratio)
Q6: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?	H1: Civic engagement and collaboration are positive predictors of higher levels of trust, social ties, and reciprocal relationships.	Residualized gain score 1 (pre survey) and time 2 (post survey) experiences of civic engagement and collaboration -Bivariate analyses (Pearsons' r)	Civic Engagement, Collaboration – Residualized Gain Scores (Ratio); Time 2 Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Social Ties, Total Reciprocal Relationships, Total Civic Engagement and Total Social Capital (Ratio)

Summary

This chapter presented the research design and methodology for this study. The conceptual framework, methods and procedures, issues of validity and reliability, operationalization of study variables, data collection procedures and data analysis plans were discussed. Chapter four presents the results of the data analysis and research findings.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

This purpose of this mixed-methods study was to examine the relationships between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital, and associations between the dimensions of social capital and openness to transformation. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of trust, engagement and relationships among residents in the Choice Neighborhoods Planning initiative – encompassing the neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights - in Shreveport, Louisiana. This chapter presents the findings from the focus groups, content analysis, survey data describing Time 1 and Time 2 survey respondents' characteristics, and quantitative analyses of the five social capital dimensions, demographic attributes, and other key variables. The five social capital dimensions included trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, social ties and reciprocal relationships. Other key variables of interest included openness to transformation, belief in ability to contribute to the civic economy, collaboration, and access to housing, education, and health care.

To begin, this chapter restates the research questions and associated hypotheses. Next, results of the qualitative analysis that examined the cognitive (values and perceptions) and structured (reported actions and behaviors) concepts related to social capital that informed the development of the survey instrument are reported. Following the qualitative findings, the descriptive data from the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys are presented and results of the quantitative analyses for research questions 2-6 are described. To examine these questions, bivariate and multivariate analysis methods were used, including t-tests, chi-square, multiple regression, and logistic regression using SPSS statistical software. Finally, a summary of the findings reported is presented at the conclusion of this chapter.

Research Questions and Associated Hypotheses

Question One: What are the residents' perceptions of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhood?

Question Two: Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as marital status, age group, educational level, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?

H_1: Social trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, and reciprocal relationships are positively correlated.

H_2-H_6: Individuals who identify as single, non-homeowners, lower educational attainment, younger, and shorter-term residents have lower levels of trust (H_2), civic engagement (H_3), social cohesion (H_4), social ties (H_5), and reciprocal relationships (H_6).

Question Three: Are residents' perceptions of social capital related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?

H_1: Levels of social capital are positive predictors of the degree of openness to neighborhood transformation.

Question Four: Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, social services and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they can contribute to their civic economy?

H_1: Residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities are more likely to believe they can contribute to their civic economy.

Question Five: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents? (To what extent do residents' perceptions of social capital increase after the Choice Neighborhood planning process?)

H_1: Levels of social capital will be higher in the post-survey than at baseline.

Question Six: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?

H_1: Civic engagement and collaboration are positive predictors of higher levels of trust, social ties, social cohesion, reciprocal relationships, and overall social capital.

Results

Research Question One

In order to gain insight regarding perceptions and lived experiences of trust and the related concepts of relationships, engagement, needs, opportunities and values held by residents, and to understand the community's readiness for involvement in the Choice Neighborhoods planning process, a series of three focus groups were conducted. The purpose of the first research objective was to gather and analyze qualitative data to inform the development of the household level survey. Research Question One: What are the residents' perceptions of systems of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?

Focus Group Participant Demographics. The focus group method employed a purposive sampling technique in order to achieve a cross-section of demographic variables that most closely reflected the larger neighborhood population. Of the three focus groups held in 2012, a total of 24 residents participated: 9 in focus group one, 7 in focus group two, and 8 in focus group three. Participants ranged in age from 33 years to 76 years old, and 14 identified as female and 10 identified as male. All participants identified as Black or African American.

Data Analysis Method: Empirical Phenomenological Inquiry. The qualitative analysis reviewed transcripts from the focus groups and the Allendale ONE plan and appendices and identified significant statements and clustered themes using Moustakas' (1994) structured

approach to phenomenology. Content was uploaded to NVivo10, and this software was used to create coded nodes of predetermined and emerging themes related to the dimensions of social capital and community readiness. From the three focus groups and two Allendale ONE documents, 254 significant statements were extracted. The researcher examined these significant statements in order to construct their formulated meanings. Table 4 includes examples of significant statements and their interpreted meaning units.

Table 4. Select Significant Statements of Residents and Formulated Meanings

Significant Statement	*Formulated Meaning*
Don't do "to" the community. Do "with" and "for" the community.	Residents want to be included as partners in planning and decision-making for their neighborhood.
Can the city be counted on to step up and improve infrastructure?	Residents question the commitment of the city to improving their neighborhood.
So little has been done for so long, without the best interests of the entire community at hand. Residents have a lack of hope and trust.	The community has been neglected and ignored. Residents are losing hope. Residents distrust the intentions of outsiders.
A plan is meaningless unless it is implemented. Identifying and nurturing leaders that understand and respect Allendale's history as well as its future is essential to moving the plan forward.	No more plans without action. Build capacity of leaders from within the community. Need leaders who understand the potential of the neighborhood to create meaningful change.

The formulated meanings were condensed and arranged into clusters using nodes, resulting in the emergence of seven major themes, with numerous sub-themes. These key themes were related to the dimensions of social capital and other key variables examined in this study.

Table 5. Seven Theme Clusters with Examples of Associated Meanings

Theme 1: Trust	Lack of trust in general Mistrust for outsiders and their intentions Need to nurture trust for residents to believe and have hope Need to build trust Lack of trust in political leadership Lack of trust in police
Theme 2: Access	Adults need access to education Too many adults are uneducated in neighborhood Literacy issues keep parents from getting involved Neighborhood is underserved Residents need access to health opportunities There are mental health needs not being met Health services need to be available to all Healthy community fosters health people Lack of quality housing Lack of affordable housing
Theme 3: Civic Economy and Empowerment	Nurture the skills of the residents to build a sustainable and prosperous neighborhood Promote the character, history and spirit of the neighborhood Focus on the people, and their skills and strengths The people of the neighborhood hold the power to rebuild and the ability to shape its future Need to help people recognize their own skills and power Need to empower and motivate residents Need to build the voice of the community People feel disempowered Lack of motivation from people who need support the most
Theme 4: Engagement and Participation	Lack of participation and motivation Need for more involvement Need for key leadership to motivate people People need to be included Build community pride Build a sense of community Neighborhood events and activities create community
Theme 5: Collaboration and Community Building	Need for effective communication Need to move in positive direction Effective strategies for ongoing collaboration Lack of collaboration among outside partners Lack of collaboration between residents and leaders Residents work together to improve neighborhood

(Table 5 continued)

Theme 5: Collaboration and Community Building (cont'd)	Change is possible when residents work together for a common purpose Strategies must encourage community building Neighbors value a strong sense of community Residents work together to build their community back
Theme 6: Connectedness and Cohesion	Need to nurture relationships Neighbors are strength of neighborhood Love of community and one another and connections between church, school, and friendship are characteristic of the neighborhood There is a need to build connections Residents are committed to their neighborhood Residents want a sense of community Residents value the soul and history of Allendale and that bonds them to one another
Theme 7: Openness to Transformation	Need to build hope in the future Spirit of hopelessness and helplessness among neighbors Need to respect history as well as future to move forward Skepticism about neighborhood improvements and its impact on the residents Feeling let down from broken promises from the past Belief in possibility of transformation Readiness for transformation

Theme 1: Trust. Coding revealed that concern about trust and mistrust was important, particularly with regards to outsider relationships. Trust in general was described as a community concern as one resident stated, "There is a lack of trust internally and externally," and another described the current conditions as a "spirit of hopelessness and lack of trust." Several residents expressed mistrust for planning processes that were focused on the neighborhood, "The lack of trust in the neighborhood is a threat," and "everyone's opinion must be included."

Other residents also connected trust to relationships, engagement and involvement, stating the need for Choice Neighborhood leaders to "help build trust," "build relationships and trust," and "provide existing residents with meaningful input to the plan." One resident

suggested, “The way to build trust is to have open networks of communication.” Several residents connected trust to the concept of empowerment. One example of this expressed in the words of a resident was “The people recognize that they have strengths, skills, and resources that can be drawn upon if trust is nurtured.”

Along with trust in general, residents shared concerns for trust relationships with local law enforcement and city officials. One resident stated there was an “overwhelming presence of open crime and lack of cooperation from city officials and the police department.” Resident trust in police in the neighborhood was mixed, as the recently initiated neighborhood policing program was described as “building trust,” while others stated that the “relations between residents and police need improving,” and there should be “regular meetings between neighborhood district police and residents.” One resident stated, “We need police protection, and right now our police – unfortunately – you don’t see them until after something happens.”

Another sub-theme of trust that emerged was trust with local government and city officials. Several residents expressed concern over the city’s commitment to their neighborhood, and the authenticity of any expressed commitment – that promises were made but investments in change have not been followed through with. Some statements that captured these concerns included, “Can the city be counted on?,” “The good ‘ole [sic] boy political system is a threat,” and from the Allendale ONE plan “A major concern raised in the planning process was a lack of trust – whether the plan will be followed by political leaders, whether a sufficient investment of money and time will be made, and whether the residents – at the grass roots level – will be involved when decisions that affect their lives are made.” When speaking about the city council, one neighbor stated, “It has a lot to do with trust,” and “I’ve gone to meeting after meeting after meeting. Filled out form after form after form. Did they turn around and do something?”

Continuing the pattern that trust could be cultivated, repaired and/or earned, one resident stated "public investment signals commitment to the neighborhood." Others expressed the view that the city was committed to improving their neighborhood; the Allendale ONE plan stated, "The neighborhood should take advantage of the current commitment of political leadership and establish continuous dialogue."

Theme 2: Access. The second theme that emerged was related to access to opportunities and services to support economic mobility, health and wellness outcomes and to promote quality of life opportunities in the neighborhood. Three major access sub-themes related to this study emerged, including access to health care, access to job training and adult education, and access to housing.

Residents described the neighborhood as "designated as a healthcare underserved area" and said there was "insufficient health care available." One resident asked, "How do we provide a healthier, quality lifestyle for residents?" and another wondered if we could "create a channel of communication so education, training, and mental/health services [were] made available to all." Residents stated a need for more "health care professionals or health care training," and "access to grocery stores and healthy foods," stating that is was a "quality of life issue." One resident suggested that "the way the community is designed can directly affect the health of its residents," another stated "a healthy community fosters healthy lifestyles," and another said that "easy access to recreational opportunities, medical care and preventative education should be a part of Allendale's neighborhood strategy."

Regarding access to adult education and job training opportunities, one resident stated, "There is high unemployment, underemployment, and a lack of living wage jobs in the neighborhood, coupled with a lack of training for jobs and business opportunities."

A few residents stated that education and training opportunities for adults did exist in the neighborhood, but there was a lack of awareness of the availability of these programs. One example of these statements was "Schools have offered GED classes, which are needed, but have had difficulty attracting adults to the programs. They need to be better promoted."

Yet other residents stated there were "no training opportunities for unemployed" and that "access is a big issue," that residents "have to travel outside the neighborhood for job training services and that a need existed for opportunities to "get from unemployed into the workforce – some kinda [sic] gateway opportunity." Many residents shared that at one time there had been services in the neighborhood, but "they have taken services from the community and gave [sic] nothing back" and, "We need a learning center that can be relatively accessible to the residents."

Residents expressed a widespread need for adults in the neighborhood to have access to education and training, and cited the "literacy issues with the parents" as having a direct impact on neighborhood youth. "A lot of parents aren't educated themselves, and so you can't help the child, and if you could give them something like that, they could go back to night school and they could help their kids," said one resident. Another resident connected a lack of education to the lack of involvement and engagement by parents, having shared that "when a parent is uneducated, sometimes they don't want the younger kids to know how uneducated they really are. So rather than having to explain sometimes they just don't let them get involved."

> If we could get some kind of educational training programs for parents, because we've got a generation of children coming along that seem to be very lost. Everything starts in the home. But when you have a young person that is trying to raise a young person – then the two don't equal out well. So if there's a way we could get some sort of assistance that is attractive that they would want to have – almost to help them raising children. You know what's important – education, your morals, your faith – all those things. Just instill those things in parents so they can in turn bring them home to the children. Otherwise you have kids that are raising themselves because the mom is always out working. (Focus Group Participant, 2012)

Residents expressed the need for "somewhere in the neighborhood where parents can go to improve themselves" and a place "they can go on their own time so they can bring themselves up." One resident wondered, "Can we come up with training programs that result in changing lives?"

A third sub-theme related to access emerged concerning housing, and this concern was generally described as "housing conditions for the neighborhood as a whole are poor." This was further narrowed to the categories of affordable housing and quality housing. Residents said they "need affordable housing," there was a need for "strategies to remove barriers and make housing more affordable," and "there are too many substandard houses, vacant lots, and deficient property standards in the neighborhood." Several residents discussed the high number of vacant lots and houses as an impediment to the neighborhood; one resident stated "vacant and adjudicated homes need to be torn down." Residents reported a lack of motivation to invest in the neighborhood as a contributor to the shortage of affordable housing, demonstrated by one resident through the statement "Home builders are not doing affordable housing because they cannot easily determine how to make it profitable."

> The number of vacant lots, vacant buildings, and substandard/dilapidated houses is significant throughout the neighborhood. Approximately two-thirds of all developable property is vacant. There are few blocks with a residence on each lot, and many where homes sit relatively isolated. It is common that where there are more incidences of vacant lots, adjacent housing is more likely to be substandard. As more houses are torn down there is less incentive to maintain property and the cycle of disinvestment continues (Allendale ONE, 2006).

Residents were concerned not only with the need for more affordable housing, but that also new housing in the neighborhood should be of high quality. One resident stated that the neighborhood "can't just have any housing development – focus on housing should be on quality development." One resident stated, "On housing – the most overlooked thing in the community

which is the strength of the community is the homeowners," and another said homeowners "make up the community," yet "there are no programs for the homeowners to improve or upkeep their homes," and "there's nothing out there for the homeowner." Neighbors were concerned that new and improved housing should "allow existing residents to remain in Allendale and preserve its unique character and historic assets" and maintain the "quality and character" of existing homes. Several residents expressed apprehension as to whether improvements to the neighborhood would result in residents being pushed out of their neighborhood. One resident said that planners must "make sure housing is maintained as affordable as we improve the neighborhood;" other residents stated that neighborhood transformation should "improve housing of existing residents," "provide a range of housing choices that meet the lifecycle needs of residents," and "provide good, quality affordable housing to ordinary citizens."

Residents connected the need for quality and affordable housing to the theme of building community, stating "housing should foster a spirit of community," and "housing developments should be designed to build community." The themes of engagement, participation and empowerment also surfaced in housing discussions, and one resident suggested the planning process should "allow the people who live in the houses to become involved in planning the quality of their own houses."

Theme 3: Civic Economy and Empowerment. In the Allendale ONE plan, it was noted that "to create a sustainable and prosperous neighborhood" there was a need to "develop policies that incentive a market competitive neighborhood that provides for racial, age, economic and cultural integration" and to "reflect the character, history and spirit of Allendale in neighborhood developments." During the focus groups, residents discussed that to "nurture a better future," there was a need to recognize the "skills in Allendale," to "build people within the people to

improve [the community]." It was shared there was a need "to get people to realize that the only power to change the neighborhood is held by them," and that "it will be the people that will rebuild the area."

Patterns of empowerment were captured through language that conveyed the feeling of hopelessness experienced by some residents, and several residents stated they once had hope in the past but no longer do, since "nothing has been done," and "so little has been done for so long." One resident said, "A lot of them think they don't have a voice. And it's not worth me coming." Many residents shared the concern that people felt disempowered and therefore were not motivated to participate in conversations regarding the civic economy and neighborhood transformation, and one noted that "this is what it takes [to improve the neighborhood] – it is just a shame this room is not crowded with concerned adults, and you know it's sad." Another neighbor said, "the problem is an overwhelming poverty rate and not much of a political voice and that's what I'm worried about." "If you don't have power behind your name, you're not gonna do stuff."

Coding for empowerment and civic economy revealed connections with themes of engagement and participation (inclusivity and motivation), trust, collaboration and authentic engagement. "The interests and needs of the people of Allendale – people first – at its center," was a message shared by one neighbor, emphasizing the importance of capturing "the desires and priorities of the residents" in plans for neighborhood transformation.

Theme 4: Engagement and Participation. Themes emerged around the need for engagement and inclusivity in neighborhood planning and improvements and motivation for participation in related activities. It was expressed that "neighborhood activities and events help to create and build community," and that residents need to be "included in the planning" for the

Choice Neighborhood initiative. One suggested the need for "neighborhood groups that work together, care for each other" and have a "spirit of volunteerism." The neighborhood transformation plan should be designed in such a way that establishes "meeting places for community" and facilitates "pride building, festivals, celebrate[s] skills and talents, old coming together with the young, cultural arts, athletics" and "where people from the neighborhood can participate." The Allendale ONE plan described the impact of engagement through "cultural and community events" as an opportunity to "strengthen a sense of community" and "build pride."

One resident said that "citizen involvement is the key" to building community. Several residents expressed concern that there was "very low turnout" in neighborhood and community events and meetings" and that "more people should be involved." "How many people [are] in this area? Over 100, right? 200? See the problem is – people who need the services the most are the ones that don't even bother to come." One resident said "you gotta find some way to motivate folks to come in the first place," and another shared "we live in a neighborhood where there are lots of people for some reason or other don't know the value of coming [to community meetings]."

> They've been programmed in a way – sorry to say it. I'm going to talk about my neighborhood and we all know it's true – but they've been programmed – some of them – they've been programmed in a certain way that if there ain't nothing out here for us, personally, then it's not worth me coming [to community meetings]. (Focus Group Participant, 2012)

Many residents cited a "need to get the parents involved" in "their kids' education," as "hardly any parents [come] out" for school events. Suggestions for improving participation and engagement included utilizing a "targeted effort to get the residents involved" because "if we're trying to improve the quality of life for people that live [here] then things have to be targeted." The churches in the community were discussed as a potential avenue for improving involvement,

as one resident explained "with 41 churches we have 41 ministers – they have flocks, and they need to reach their flocks; if we can motivate the leaders, we can motivate the flocks."

Theme 5: Collaboration and Community Building. Intersecting with the empowerment theme that emerged indicating residents were the key to rebuilding the community, residents said the planning process "requires collaboration" and "the people who work and reside in the neighborhood to lead its rebuilding." In a focus group, residents shared "we're trying to bring this neighborhood back," and the need was expressed for "action that is focused, committed, collaborative and inclusive." The Allendale ONE plan pointed to the need for leadership to "guide their conversations forward into doable actions." Residents did not want outsiders to come in and transform their community without their input and leadership, and one neighbor stated, "Don't do TO the community; do WITH and FOR the community."

Some other examples of the need for collaboration included the comment that "resource agencies and organizations available inside or outside the neighborhood do not work together – there is a lack of collaboration," and a need "to improve collaboration between the 51 neighborhood churches and the programs and services they provide." One resident observed: "What we gotta do –it's complex. Look at the churches in the community who are doing things. But they can't do it alone. If they do then it's done in isolation. It creates an isolation effect."

Strategies to improve collaboration and build community that were suggested included a need for building "effective community between leadership" in order that people "could work together [toward] a positive direction." One resident stated that "no one is an island," and "the sum of the whole is greater than its parts." The Allendale ONE plan captured the need for collaboration to build community as "leaders working together empowers the neighborhood to act effectively." Mobilizing the community, including residents in planning, and building

"consensus and movement in a positive direction" was important to residents regarding collaboration and building up the community; one neighbor shared that "they have to come together for a purpose, all the people that's connected – I know it can happen." One resident emphasized, "We've got to build the community back. The census from 1980 or 1990 – population was 17,000. By 2000 it was closer to 6 or 7,000, and that's actually going up a little now, but we've got to get people back in the community."

Theme 6: Connectedness and Cohesion. "A neighborhood is much more than the homes within its borders." In talking about their neighborhood, residents wanted a "simple life, a place for ordinary people" and a "sense of community and neighborhood, real common life." One resident said "Allendale is about people and community – focus on people first." Another described Allendale as having "a soul – family and community where everyone knows everyone." Residents wanted to see a "spirit of family," with a "community, people focus." The Allendale ONE plan described residents' views of Allendale historically "as a place where neighbors knew each other and helped each other out." More recently, the community was concerned that "crime and lack of a sense of safety in the neighborhood keeps people closed – physically and spiritually."

One resident stated the need for commitment "to community building, going door to door, helping out neighbors in need and becoming friends," and another "a neighborhood of people that care and want to change their lives and Allendale." Another resident stated "the culture" and "sense of community" was what makes the neighborhood unique.

Residents spoke of the opportunities and services provided through the numerous neighborhood churches, and one said "if you're not a part of those churches – then they aren't connected – they won't use services, they don't think they are for them." Many residents viewed

the churches as an asset to the community and a place that connected people, but shared that the experience was not the same for all residents in the neighborhood: "You know what it's all about – churches take care of their own. If you're in the church then you'll get taken care of, but that's not always the case. Because unless you pay your tithe, if you don't pay your tithe then you are going to get overlooked."

Residents described numerous strengths of the neighborhood as "my neighbors," "friendship," "love," "connectivity between neighbors, schools and churches," and "the feeling of the familiar and all the memories my family has created." Residents felt it was important to "nurture connections" and to "build relationships that will allow us to work together" to enact meaningful change.

Theme 7: Openness to Transformation. When asked about openness to transformation and revitalization of their neighborhood, residents commonly responded by reflecting on experiences and feelings of both skepticism and optimism for the future. "Efforts are needed to lift up existing residents to build hope," one resident said. Conversations with neighbors revealed a mixture of hope, skepticism and resignation about the future of the neighborhood, which was once "the heart of the black community" in Shreveport. One resident wanted to see improvements to the area, but to "keep Allendale, Allendale." Another asked, "A lot of the love once in Allendale is no longer there – how do we rehabilitate the people for new opportunities?" The Allendale ONE plan cited the sentiment that "so little has been done for so long . . . without the best interests of the community" that "residents have a lack of hope and trust in change in their neighborhood."

> Our neighborhood is better now than what it used to be. Allendale is like any other neighborhood. I think the reasons people don't want to be in our neighborhood is [sic] because of the shotgun houses and the people doing drugs. If we get rid of the people doing drugs we can have a better neighborhood. (Focus Group Participant, 2012)

Residents had questions about how neighborhood improvements would be possible "without driving out any of the current residents," as one neighbor said, "It's clear that improving the neighborhood will increase the cost of living." Skepticism for the future surfaced with comments such as "don't let this plan follow so many others that displace existing residents" and "we want to know what is going on - we've been built up and built up and nothing has happened - change hasn't happened."

Residents shared the need to promote the people in the neighborhood to realize meaningful change, and that there was a need for "people moving in a forward direction so that the community could also move forward." One resident described the need for community mobilization as, "I've seen this neighborhood going from good to, you know, now it's pretty much kind of bad – it's kind of up to us to do whatever it takes to help it get back where it was or even better than what it is."

Some residents expressed "hope of a better future," and that they "would like to see it come back;" another saw "the potential in the community," so long as people were committed to "staying focused, committed and open." One neighbor stated, "I have a real passion for what's happening and what's going to happen in the community." "We have to share with the younger generations the legacy that was once here, the history. At one point in time it was the community of choice to live. And it can return to that."

Descriptive Survey Results

Survey Participant Demographics. Participants in the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys included heads of households from occupied residences located in the target Choice Neighborhood. A total of 236 heads of households completed the Time 1 Survey, for a response rate of 26.8% of the total frame of the number of households in the neighborhood (n = 881) of

presumed occupied households. For the post-survey a total of 59 post-surveys were completed, for a response rate of 36.2% of the total sample (n = 163). The large difference in number of respondents between the Time 1 and Time 2 survey can be explained by the number of Time 1 Surveys that were missing links to street addresses (n = 73), the number of households that were no longer occupied or the residents that had participated in the Time 1 Survey had since moved (n = 38), and the number of households that refused to complete the Time 2 Survey (n = 12). Additionally, resources to conduct the Time 2 Survey were more restricted than at Time 1, therefore the length of time canvassing the streets in the neighborhood was shortened to four weeks, and households were approached two times instead of three before a survey with a pre-paid envelope was left on residents' homes.

Demographic characteristics captured in the survey included variables such as age, gender, race or ethnicity, marital status educational attainment, household level income, homeowner status, and length of time in neighborhood. Findings from the descriptive analysis are displayed in Table 6. With all questions, respondents were given the option of "I prefer not to answer." Of the 236 survey participants, 135 identified as females (57.2%) and 54 identified as males (22.9%). The reported ages of respondents ranged from 18 to 94 years (n = 173), with a mean of 57.96 (SD = 18.4). There was minimal variability found regarding reported race, as 201 (94.4% of those reporting race or ethnicity) identified as Black or African American, while eight (3.8%) identified as White or Caucasian, one (0.5%) identified as of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin, and three (1.4%) identified as "two or more races" and/or "other." The majority of respondents who reported a relationship status identified as "single" (41.4%), while 48 (25.8%) identified as married or with a partner, 33 (17.7%) widowed, and 28 (15.1%) divorced or separated.

Regarding education attainment, 13.6% (32) of all survey participants reported having not obtained a high school degree, 44.4% (86) held a regular high school diploma, GED or alternative credential, 15.7% (37) had attended some college at a 2 or 4 year university or college, 5.1% (12) reported having obtained an associate's degree, 6.8% (16) a college degree, and 6.8% (16) had earned more than a college degree. Of those reporting household-level income (n=135), 83 (61.5%) reported earning less than $15,000 in the year prior to the survey, 25 (10.6%) reported earning between $15,000 and $25,000, 21 (8.9%) reported earning between $25,0001 and $50,000, and only 6 (2.5%) reported earning more than $50,000 from all household income sources in the past year. One hundred (42.4%) of survey respondents reported owning their home. The average length of time living in the neighborhood reported (n=183) was 28.18 years (SD=21.94), with a minimum of less than one month to a maximum of 90 years.

Table 6: Demographic Characteristics of Participants Ages 18-94 (Time 1)

Demographic Variables		n = 236	(%)
Gender	Female	135	(57.2)
	Male	54	(22.9)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	47	(19.9)
Race or Ethnicity	Black/African American	201	(85.2)
	White/Caucasian	8	(3.4)
	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	1	(0.4)
	Other	3	(1.3)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	23	(9.7)
Marital Status	Single	77	(32.6)
	Have a partner	16	(6.8)

(Table 6 continued)

Demographic Variables		n = 236	(%)
Marital Status (cont'd)	Married	32	(13.6)
	Widowed	33	(14.0)
	Divorced	19	(8.1)
	Separated	9	(3.8)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	50	(21.2)
Educational Attainment	Less than high school degree	32	(13.6)
	Regular high school diploma	67	(32.1)
	GED or alternative credential	29	(12.3)
	Some college, 2 or 4 year university or college	37	(15.7)
	Associate degree	12	(5.1)
	College degree	16	(6.8)
	More than a college degree	16	(6.8)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	27	(11.4)
Income Level – Household	Less than $15,000	83	(61.5)
	Between $15,000-$25,000	25	(10.6)
	Between $25,001-$50,000	21	(8.9)
	More than $50,000	6	(2.5)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	101	(42.8)
Owner Status	Own this home	100	(42.4)
	Do not own this home (rent)	76	(32.2)
	Prefer not to answer/Missing	60	(25.4)

Time 1 Social Capital and Key Measures. Key variables of interest measured in this study pertaining to social capital included the following dimensions: trust, social cohesion, reciprocal relationships, social ties, and civic engagement. As explained in the previous chapter, the trust, social ties and civic engagement scales were adapted from the Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey (Putnam, 2000), social cohesion scale adapted from the Collective Efficacy Scale (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997), and the reciprocal relationships scale was excerpted from the National Survey of Black Americans Survey (Jackson & Neighbors, 1992).

Residents were asked three separate survey questions related to how much they trusted different groups of people, including other people in the neighborhood, police in the neighborhood, and local government. For the Time 1 Survey, analyses of the frequencies of the individual trust factors revealed respondents held the greatest amount of trust in police in the neighborhood (25.6%), followed by trust for other people in the neighborhood (15.7%), and trust in local government (9%). Approximately 1 out of every 5 (21.7%) residents surveyed reported not trusting local government at all, while 19.3% reported no trust in other people in the neighborhood, and 14.6% reported no trust in police in the neighborhood. Trust variables were coded from 0-3 (0 = not at all and 3 = a lot). The average trust score for people in the neighborhood (n = 201) was 1.53 (SD = 1.02), for police in the neighborhood (n = 200) was slightly higher at 1.75 (SD = 1.04), and for local government (n = 187) was lowest at 1.33 (SD = 0.96). Similar to a method used by Pyles and Cross (2008) to examine social capital in low wealth neighborhoods, a Total Trust score was created for each respondent by averaging the three trust measures. The minimum total trust score (n = 220) was zero and the maximum three, with an average total trust score of 1.50 (SD = 0.81). For each measure, around 10% of

respondents were not sure about how much they trusted each group, with the greatest level of uncertainty directed toward local government (people in the neighborhood – 9.9%; police in the neighborhood – 8.7%, and local government – 11.8%). Table 7 presents the frequencies, mean, and standard deviation of each indicator of trust.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – TRUST

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
People in Neighborhood (n=223)	A lot	35	(15.7)	1.53	1.02
	Some	79	(35.4)		
	A little	44	(19.7)		
	Not at all	43	(19.3)		
	Not sure	22	(9.9)		
Police in Neighborhood (n=219)	A lot	56	(25.6)	1.75	1.04
	Some	70	(32.0)		
	A little	42	(19.2)		
	Not at all	32	(14.6)		
	Not sure	19	(8.7)		
Local Government (n=212)	A lot	19	(9.0)	1.33	0.96
	Some	69	(32.5)		
	A little	53	(25.0)		
	Not at all	46	(21.7)		
	Not sure	25	(11.8)		
TOTAL TRUST (n=220) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.50	.814

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

In examining social cohesion, survey participants were asked to report their level of agreement with the following three statements for the pre-survey: (a) I live in a close-knit neighborhood; (b) People in this neighborhood generally get along with each other; and (c) People in this neighborhood are willing to help their neighbors. Social cohesion variables were coded from 0-3 (0 = strongly disagree and 3 = strongly agree). Overall, the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they lived in a close-knit neighborhood (64.9%, n = 141), while 25.4 % (n = 55) either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-one respondents (9.7%) were unsure whether they lived in a close knit neighborhood or not. Regarding level of agreement with the statement that people get along with each other, a strong majority (80.4%, n = 176) either agreed or strongly agreed, while 12.7% (n = 28) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 6.8% (n = 15) were uncertain. For the statement of whether people in the neighborhood are willing to help each other, 67.5% (n = 145) agreed or strongly agreed, 24.2% (n = 52) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 7.6% (n = 18) were uncertain. The mean scores for the social cohesion measures were 1.87 for close-knit (n = 196, SD = 0.86), 2.07 for getting along (n = 204, SD = 0.68), and 1.87 for willingness to help neighbors (n = 197, SD = 0.90). The Total Social Cohesion score average for this scale was 1.89 (n = 221, SD = 0.77).

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – SOCIAL COHESION

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Close knit neighborhood (n=217)	Strongly disagree	16	(7.4)	1.87	.861
	Disagree	39	(18.0)		
	Agree	96	(44.2)		

(Table 8 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Close knit neighborhood (n=217)	Strongly agree	45	(20.7)		
	Not sure	21	(9.7)		
People get along with each other (n=219)	Strongly disagree	6	(2.7)	2.07	.680
	Disagree	22	(10.0)		
	Agree	127	(58.0)		
	Strongly agree	49	(22.4)		
	Not sure	15	(6.8)		
People are willing to help neighbors (n=215)	Strongly disagree	21	(9.8)	1.87	.899
	Disagree	31	(14.4)		
	Agree	98	(45.6)		
	Strongly agree	47	(21.9)		
	Not sure	18	(7.6)		
TOTAL SOCIAL COHESION (n=221) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.89	.771

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

Residents were asked four questions related to reciprocal exchanges in their relationships with friends and family, to gauge the degree of support they get and give to family and friends.

Reciprocal relationships variables were coded from 0-3, with 0 being "not at all" and 3 being "a lot." When asked how much they get help or support from family, 33.5% (n = 57) reported not at all, 15.3% (n = 26) reported a little, 24.1% (n = 41) reported some, 19.4% (n = 33) reported a lot, and 7.6% (n = 13) were not sure. The average for getting help from family was 1.32 (n = 157, SD = 1.17). In regards to giving help and support to family, a majority of respondents (80.1%, n = 141) reported giving a lot or some support, while 10.2% (n = 18) reported giving a little, 7.4% (n = 13) reported giving none at all, and 2.3% (n = 4) were uncertain. The average for giving help to family was 2.23 (n = 172, SD = 0.92). The highest frequency of categories reported for getting help or support from friends was some (36.2%, n = 63), while 44.1% (n = 77) reported getting either a little support or none at all, and 18.4% (n = 32) reported getting a lot of support or help from friends. The mean for getting help from friends was 1.56 (n = 172, SD = 0.99). The final question asked how much support or help was given by participants to friends, to which a strong majority (77%, n = 124) reported giving some or a lot of support, 15.5% (n = 25) reported giving a little, and 6.8% (n = 11) reported giving none at all. The average for giving help to friends was 2.07 (n = 160, SD = 0.89). The average score for Total Reciprocal Relationships was 1.78 (n = 220, SD = 0.74)

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIPS

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Get help or support from family (n=170)	Not at all	57	(33.5)	1.32	1.17
	A little	26	(15.3)		
	Some	41	(24.1)		
	A lot	33	(19.4)		

(Table 9 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Get help or support from family (n=170)	Not sure	13	(7.6)		
Give help or support to family (n=176)	Not at all	13	(7.4)	2.23	.919
	A little	18	(10.2)		
	Some	57	(32.4)		
	A lot	84	(47.7)		
	Not sure	4	(2.3)		
Get help or support from friends (n=174)	Not at all	31	(17.8)	1.56	.992
	A little	46	(26.4)		
	Some	63	(36.2)		
	A lot	32	(18.4)		
	Not sure	2	(1.1)		
Give help or support to friends (n=161)	Not at all	11	(6.8)	2.07	.891
	A little	25	(15.5)		
	Some	66	(41.0)		
	A lot	58	(36.0)		
	Not sure	1	(0.6)		
TOTAL RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIPS (n=220) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.78	.738

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The fourth social capital scale measured social ties. The questions included in this measure examined the frequency residents visited with other friends inside and outside the neighborhood in their homes, community leaders, and friends of a different race. The variables were coded 0-3 with 0 representing "never," and 3 representing "once a week or more." When asked to report the number of times they had friends to their home in the past year, 33% (n = 59) reported once a week or more, 16.8% (n = 30) reported once a month, 25.7% (46) reported once or twice, 16.8% (30) reported never, and 7.8% (14) were not sure. Nearly 44% (n = 78) of residents reported never having been in the home of a friend of a different race or having them in their home in the past year, while 25.3% (n = 45) related once or twice, 6.7% (n = 12) reported once a month, 15.7% (n = 28) reported once a week or more, and 8.4% (15) were not sure. When asked how many times in the past year they had been in the home of someone from a different neighborhood or had them in their home, 26.5% (n = 48) reported never, 31.5% (n = 57) stated once or twice, 13.8% (n =25) said once a month, 21% (n = 38) stated once a week or more, and 7.2% (n = 13) were not sure. The final measure on social ties asked residents to recall in the past year how many times they had been in the home of someone they considered to be a community leader or had them in their home. The majority of residents reported never (58.8%, n = 107), while 22.5% (n = 41) reported once or twice, 4.9% (n = 9) reported once a month, 4.9% (n = 9) reported once a week or more, and 8.8% (n = 16) were not sure. The mean scores for the social ties measures were 1.72 for friends to home (n = 165, SD = 1.14), 0.94 for friends of a different race (n = 163, SD = 1.12), 1.32 for friend of a different neighborhood (n = 168, SD = 1.12), and 0.52 for home of community leader (n = 166, SD = 0.83). The average score for Total Social Ties was 1.14 (n = 184, SD = 0.77).

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – SOCIAL TIES

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
No. times friends to home past year (n=179)	Never	30	(16.8)	1.72	1.14
	Once or twice	46	(25.7)		
	Once a month	30	(16.8)		
	Once a week or more	59	(33.0)		
	Not sure	14	(7.8)		
No. times friends different race past year (n=178)	Never	78	(43.8)	.939	1.12
	Once or twice	45	(25.3)		
	Once a month	12	(6.7)		
	Once a week or more	28	(15.7)		
	Not sure	15	(8.4)		
No. times home different neighborhood (n=181)	Never	48	(26.5)	1.32	1.12
	Once or twice	57	(31.5)		
	Once a month	25	(13.8)		
	Once a week or more	38	(21.0)		
	Not sure	13	(7.2)		

(Table 10 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
No. times home community leader (n=182)	Never	107	(58.8)	.518	.829
	Once or twice	41	(22.5)		
	Once a month	9	(4.9)		
	Once a week or more	9	(4.9)		
	Not sure	16	(8.8)		
TOTAL SOCIAL TIES (n=184) (Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00)				1.14	.772

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The final social capital dimension, Civic Engagement, consisted of a scale of five questions related to civic participation. The first two variables asked how often residents volunteered and participated in community activities, and was coded from 0-3, with 0 representing "never," and 3 representing "once a week or more." When asked how often they have volunteered or helped with activities in their community 44.1% (n = 97) of residents reported never, 20.5% (n = 45) reported once or twice, 15.9% (n = 35) reported once a month, 10.9% (n = 24) reported once a week or more, and 8.6% (n = 19) stated they were unsure. Regarding how often they had attended a public meeting in which there was a discussion of neighborhood or school affairs, 50.9% (n = 112) reported never, followed by 28.2% (n = 62) at once or twice, 9.1% (n = 20) reported once a month, 3.2% (n = 7) stated once a week or more, and 8.6% (n = 19) were unsure. The average for volunteerism was 0.93 (n = 201, SD = 1.07), and for meeting participation was 0.61 (n = 201, SD = 0.81). Residents were also asked how interested they were in local politics, to which 27.2% (n = 42) reported not at all, 15.5% (n = 24)

reported a little, 9.7% (n = 15) stated some, 25.8% (n = 40) reported a lot, and 25.8% (n = 40) reported they were unsure. The average score for interest in local politics was 1.44 (n = 121, SD = 1.27). The majority of residents (77.9%, n = 116) stated they had not served as an officer or served on a committee of any local or neighborhood club, religious, or school-related organizations in the past six months. Similarly, 61.8% (n = 118) said they (or anyone in their household) had not ever talked to a political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement. The dichotomous variables were recoded as 0 or 3 (0 = no, 3 = yes) to give them equal weight for calculating the Total Civic Engagement Score. The mean Total Civic Engagement Score was 0.93 (n = 223, SD = 0.81).

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Volunteered or helped in community (n=220)	Never	97	(44.1)	.930	1.07
	Once or twice	45	(20.5)		
	Once a month	35	(15.9)		
	Once a week or more	24	(10.9)		
	Not sure	19	(8.6)		
Attended public meeting – neighborhood or school affairs	Never	112	(50.9)	.612	.805
	Once or twice	62	(28.2)		
	Once a month	20	(9.1)		

(Table 11 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Attended public meeting – neighborhood or school affairs (n=220)	Once a week or more	7	(3.2)	.612	.805
	Not sure	19	(8.6)		
Interested in local politics (n=155)	Not at all	42	(27.1)	1.44	1.27
	A little	24	(15.5)		
	Some	15	(9.7)		
	A lot	40	(25.8)		
	Not sure	34	(21.9)		
Served as officer or on committee local/neigh. club or organization (n=149)	No	116	(77.9)	.221	.417
	Yes	33	(22.1)		

(Table 11 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Talked to political official about neighborhood improvements (n=191)	No	118	(61.8)	.382	.487
	Yes	73	(38.2)		
TOTAL CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (n=223) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				.932	.810

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

Other variables of primary interest included openness to transformation, belief in ability to impact the civic economy, and participation in collaborative action in the neighborhood. Guided by the resident focus groups and through the collaborative process in designing the survey constructs, openness to transformation was operationalized as optimism about the future. When residents were asked to think about the future of their neighborhood over the next five years, 54.1% (n = 59) stated they thought it was going to change for the better, 32.1% (n = 35) believed it would stay the same, and 13.8% (n = 15) stated it would change for the worse. The mean for openness to transformation was 1.40 (n = 109, SD = 0.72). Regarding the civic economy, residents were also asked if they felt they (and their household) had the ability to improve or make decisions that affected their neighborhood. A strong majority (76.8%, n = 119) reported the belief that they did have the ability to impact their civic economy (n = 190, M = 0.77, SD = 0.42). Collaboration was operationalized as the reported behavior of working with others to improve their neighborhood. When asked to report if they (or anyone in their

household) had ever gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize a neighborhood improvement, 61.1% (n = 116) stated yes, while 38.9% (n = 74) said they had not. Finally, residents were asked to report how connected they were to their neighbors, to which 56% (n = 93) stated they felt either close or very close, 29.5% (n = 49) felt somewhat close, and 14.5% (n = 24) felt not close at all (n = 166, M = 1.69, SD = 1.03).

Table 12: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) – Openness to Transformation, Civic Economy, Collaboration and Connectedness

Key Variables (Codes)		n = 236	(%)	M	SD
Openness to neighborhood transformation (n=109)	Change for the better (2)	59	(54.1)	1.40	.722
	Stay the same (1)	35	(32.1)		
	Change for the worse (0)	15	(13.8)		
Contribute to the civic Economy (n=190)	No (0)	36	(23.2)	.768	.424
	Yes (1)	119	(76.8)		
Collaboration (n=190)	No (0)	74	(38.9)	.389	.489
	Yes (1)	116	(61.1)		
Connectedness to neighbors	Not close at all (0)	24	(14.5)	1.69	1.03

(Table 12 continued)

Key Variables (Codes)		n = 236	(%)	M	SD
Connectedness to neighbors (n=166)	Somewhat close (1)	49	(29.5)	1.69	1.03
	Close (2)	48	(28.9)		
	Very close (3)	45	(27.1)		

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The final questions considered in this study were related to perceived access to conditions that are related to community health, quality of life and economic mobility. These questions asked specifically about residents' levels of satisfaction with access to health care, access to affordable housing, access to quality housing, and access to education and training programs in the neighborhood. Fifty-six percent (n = 109) reported being satisfied or completely satisfied with access to health care, as compared to 43.8% (n = 85) of residents who were either unsatisfied or completely unsatisfied (n = 194, M = 1.55, SD = 1.15). When asked about satisfaction with access to affordable housing, 35.1% (n = 68) were completely unsatisfied, while 21.6% (n = 42) were unsatisfied, 23.2% (n = 45) were satisfied, and 20.1% (n = 39) were completely satisfied (n = 194, M = 1.28, SD = 1.15). For quality housing, 37.1% (n = 72) of residents were completely unsatisfied, 23.7% (n = 46) were unsatisfied, 22.2% (n = 43) were satisfied, and 17% (n = 33) were completely satisfied (n = 194, M = 1.19, SD = 1.12). The final access question studied – satisfaction with access to education and training opportunities – revealed a majority of residents were either completely unsatisfied or unsatisfied with access

(60.2%, n = 94), while 39.8% (n = 62) were either satisfied or completely satisfied (n = 156, M = 1.25, SD = 1.13).

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 1 Survey) - ACCESS

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Health Care: (n=194)	Completely Unsatisfied	53	(27.3)	1.55	1.15
	Unsatisfied	32	(16.5)		
	Satisfied	59	(30.4)		
	Completely Satisfied	50	(25.8)		
Affordable Housing (n=194)	Completely Unsatisfied	68	(35.1)	1.28	1.15
	Unsatisfied	42	(21.6)		
	Satisfied	45	(23.2)		
	Completely Satisfied	39	(20.1)		
Quality Housing (n=194)	Completely Unsatisfied	72	(37.1)	1.19	1.12
	Unsatisfied	46	(23.7)		
	Satisfied	43	(22.2)		
	Completely Satisfied	33	(17.0)		

(Table 13 continued)

Key Variables		n=236	(%)	M	SD
Education and Training (n=156)	Completely Unsatisfied	54	(34.6)	1.25	1.13
	Unsatisfied	40	(25.6)		
	Satisfied	31	(19.9)		
	Completely Satisfied	31	(19.9)		

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

Time 2 Social Capital and Key Measures. Fifty-nine of the 163 households who completed the Time 1 Survey with linked addresses also completed the Time 2 Survey one year after the Choice Neighborhood planning process was initiated. The Time 2 Survey was an abbreviated form of the original survey, and Time 2-indicators measured the same constructs examined the same social capital constructs and other key variables included in the Time 1-survey.

The follow-up responses to trust revealed slightly higher levels of trust overall. When asked how much residents trusted other people in their neighborhood, 52.6% (n = 30) reported a lot or some trust in their neighbors, and 38.6% (n = 22) reported having a little or no trust at all in others, with 8.8% (n = 5) unsure. The average of trust in others was higher in the Time 2 survey by 0.18 (n = 52, M = 1.71, SD = 1.05). Regarding trust in police, 36.4% (n = 20) reported a lot of trust in police, 29.1% (n = 16) stated they had some trust in police, while 25.5% (n = 14) and 5.5% (n = 3) reported a little or no trust at all in police, with 3.6% (n = 2) uncertain. The average for trust in police was higher in the Time 2 survey by 0.25 (n = 53, M = 2.00, SD =

0.94). Trust in local government was slightly higher in the Time 2 survey by 0.07 (n = 48, M = 1.40, SD = 0.89). Nearly seventeen percent (n = 9) of residents surveyed reported no trust in local government, 27.8% (n = 15) stated a little trust, 37% (n = 20) reported some trust, and 7.4% (n = 4) reported a lot of trust, with 11.1% (n = 6) unsure. The mean Total Trust score of the Time 2 survey was 1.74 (n = 56, SD = 0.76), which was 0.24 higher than the Time 1 score.

Table 14: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 2 Survey) – TRUST

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Trust – People in Neighborhood (n=57)	A lot	15	(26.3)	1.71	1.05
	Some	15	(26.3)		
	A little	14	(24.6)		
	Not at all	8	(14.0)		
	Not sure	5	(8.8)		
Trust – Police in Neighborhood (n=55)	A lot	20	(36.4)	2.00	.941
	Some	16	(29.1)		
	A little	14	(25.5)		
	Not at all	3	(5.5)		
	Not sure	2	(3.6)		
Trust – Local Government (n=54)	A lot	4	(7.4)	1.40	.892
	Some	20	(37.0)		
	A little	15	(27.8)		
	Not at all	9	(16.7)		
	Not sure	6	(11.1)		

(Table 14 continued)

Key Variables	M	SD
TOTAL TRUST (n=56) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00	1.74	.762

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The second social capital measure – social cohesion – also revealed higher overall average scores as compared to the Time 2 Survey. The majority of residents (75%, n = 42) either agreed or strongly agreed that they lived in a close-knit neighborhood, while 16.1% (n = 9) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. The average for the close-knit indicator was higher in the Time 2 survey by 0.21 (n = 50, M = 2.08, SD = 0.82). When asked their level of agreement that people generally get along with each other, 73.6% (n = 42) either agreed or strongly agreed, while 8.8% (n = 5) disagreed, 3.5% (n = 2) strongly disagreed, and 14% (n = 8) were uncertain. The average for the people get along indicator was higher by 0.18 from Time 1 to Time 2 (n = 49, M = 2.25, SD = 0.80). The final social cohesion indicator examined level of agreement with people's willingness to help their neighbors, to which 69.6% (n = 39) either agreed or strongly agreed, while 14.3% (n = 8) disagreed, 8.9% (n = 5) strongly disagreed, and 7.1% (n = 4) were uncertain. The average score for willingness to help neighbors was higher in the Time 2 survey by 0.17 (n = 52, M = 2.04, SD = 0.97). Overall, the Total Social Cohesion average was higher than Time 1 by 0.15 (n = 56, M = 2.04, SD = 0.82).

Table 15: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 2 Survey) – SOCIAL COHESION

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Close knit neighborhood	Strongly disagree	3	(5.4)	2.08	.821

(Table 15 continued)

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Close knit neighborhood (n=56)	Disagree	6	(10.7)		
	Agree	26	(46.4)		
	Strongly agree	16	(28.6)		
	Not sure	5	(8.9)		
People get along with each other (n=57)	Strongly disagree	2	(3.5)	2.25	.804
	Disagree	5	(8.8)		
	Agree	21	(36.8)		
	Strongly agree	21	(36.8)		
	Not sure	8	(14.0)		
People are willing to help neighbors (n=56)	Strongly disagree	5	(8.9)	2.04	.969
	Disagree	8	(14.3)		
	Agree	19	(33.9)		
	Strongly agree	20	(35.7)		
	Not sure	4	(7.1)		
TOTAL SOCIAL COHESION (n=56) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				2.04	.822

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The total average for reciprocal relationships was essentially the same from Time 1 to Time 2 measurement; the Time 2 score was slightly lower than the Time 1 score by 0.01 (n = 57, M = 1.77, SD = 0.71). In the Time 2 survey, 47.2% (n = 26) reported getting either a lot or some help or support from family, with 10.9% (n = 6) getting a little, 38.2% (n = 21) getting none at all, and 3.6% (n = 2) unsure. The measure of support from family was slightly higher (by 0.02) in the Time 2 survey (n = 53, M = 1.34, SD = 1.24). At 72.7% (n = 40), the majority of residents reported giving either some or a lot of support to family, while 18.2% (n = 10) reported giving a little, 7.1% (n = 4) reported giving none at all, and 3.6% (n = 2) were not sure. The measure of giving support to family was reported lower at Time 2, by 0.12, with an average at Time 2 of 2.11 (n = 54, SD = 0.97). When asked at Time 2 how often they got help or support from friends, 50.9% (n = 29) reported getting some or a lot, 36.8% (n = 21) reported getting a little, 10.5% (n = 6) reported getting none at all, and 1.8% (n = 1) were unsure. The average for getting help or support from friends was higher at the Time 2 survey by 0.08, with an average of 1.64 (n = 56, SD = 0.96). Regarding giving help or support to friends, 70% (n = 35) reported giving either a lot or some, 22% (n = 11) gave a little, 6% (n = 3) gave none at all, and 2% (n = 1) were unsure. The average for giving support or help to friends was 2.06 (n = 49, SD = 0.94).

Table 16: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 2 Survey) – RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIPS

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Get help or support from family (n=55)	Not at all	21	(38.2)	1.34	1.24
	A little	6	(10.9)		
	Some	13	(23.6)		
	A lot	13	(23.6)		

(Table 16 continued)

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Get help or support from family (n=55)	Not sure	2	(3.6)	1.34	1.24
Give help or support to family (n=56)	Not at all	4	(7.1)	2.11	.965
	A little	10	(18.2)		
	Some	16	(29.1)		
	A lot	24	(43.6)		
	Not sure	2	(3.6)		
Get help or support from friends (n=57)	Not at all	6	(10.5)	1.64	.961
	A little	21	(36.8)		
	Some	16	(28.1)		
	A lot	13	(22.8)		
	Not sure	1	(1.8)		
Give help or support to friends (n=50)	Not at all	3	(6.0)	2.06	.944
	A little	11	(22.0)		
	Some	15	(30.0)		
	A lot	20	(40.0)		
	Not sure	1	(2.0)		
TOTAL RECIPROCAL RELATIONSHIPS (n = 57) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.77	.708

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The fourth social capital dimension, social ties, was slightly higher in the average of the Total Social Cohesion score at Time 2 (n = 56, M = 1.32, SD = 0.76) when compared to Time 1, by 0.18. Results for the number of times in the past year respondents had friends over to their home revealed 29.1% (n = 16) reporting once a week or more, 25.5% (n = 14) reported once a month, 25.5% (n = 14) reported once or twice, 9.1% (n = 5) reported never, and 10.9% (n = 6) reported they were unsure. The average number of times of having friends to their home was higher by 0.12 (1.84) in the post-survey (n = 49, SD = 1.01). The number of times reported of being in the home of or having been in the home of friends of a different race was 17.3% (n = 9) once a week or more, 7.7% (n = 4) once a month, 26.9% (n = 14) once or twice, 40.4% (n = 21) never, and 7.7% (n = 4) were unsure. The average score for this Time 2 was 1.02 (n = 48, SD = 1.14), which was higher by 0.08 in comparison to Time 1. Regarding the number of times respondents had been in the home of someone from a different neighborhood or had them in their home, 26.4% (n = 14) reported once a week or more, 17% (n = 9) reported once a month, 32.1% (n = 17) reported once or twice, 17% (n = 9) reported never, and 7.5% (n = 4) were unsure. The average for friends from a different neighborhood was 1.57 (n = 49, SD = 1.10), which was 0.25 higher as compared to the pre-test average. When asked to report the number of times in the past year participants had been in the home of someone they considered to be a community leader or had them in their home, 7.3% (n = 4) reported once a week or more, 10.9% (n = 6) reported once a month, 23.6% (n = 13) reported once or twice, 50.9% (n = 28) reported never, and 7.3% (n = 4) were unsure. The average Time 2 score for the community leader measure was 0.73 (n = 51, SD = 0.96), which was 0.21 higher than the Time 1 average.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 2 Survey) – SOCIAL TIES

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
No. times friends to home past year (n=55)	Never	5	(9.1)	1.84	1.01
	Once or twice	14	(25.5)		
	Once a month	14	(25.5)		
	Once a week or more	16	(29.1)		
	Not sure	6	(10.9)		
No. times friends different race past year (n=52)	Never	21	(40.4)	1.02	1.14
	Once or twice	14	(26.9)		
	Once a month	4	(7.7)		
	Once a week or more	9	(17.3)		
	Not sure	4	(7.7)		
No. times home different neighborhood (n=53)	Never	9	(17.0)	1.57	1.10
	Once or twice	17	(32.1)		
	Once a month	9	(17.0)		
	Once a week or more	14	(26.4)		
	Not sure	4	(7.5)		

(Table 17 continued)

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
No. times home community leader (n=55)	Never	28	(50.9)	.726	.961
	Once or twice	13	(23.6)		
	Once a month	6	(10.9)		
	Once a week or more	4	(7.3)		
	Not sure	4	(7.3)		
TOTAL SOCIAL TIES (n = 56) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.32	.762

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

The final social capital scale of civic engagement revealed Time 1 to Time 2 survey averages higher by .07 for Total Civic Engagement, with a mean score of 1.00 (n = 57, SD = 0.83). On the volunteer measure, Time 2 scores found 17% (n = 9) of participants reported volunteering or helping out with activities in the community over the past six months once a week or more, 17% (n = 9) reported once a month, 20.8% (n = 11) reported once or twice, 39.6% (n = 21) reported never, and 5.6% (n = 3) were unsure. The mean score for volunteering was 1.12 (n = 50, SD = 1.15); this was found to be higher by 0.19 from the Time 1 average. When residents were asked how often in the past six months they had attended a public meeting in which there was a discussion of neighborhood or school affairs, 13.4% (n = 7) reported either once a month or once a week or more, 42.3% (n = 22) reported once or twice, and 38.5% (n = 20) reported never, while 5.8% (n = 3) were unsure. The average participation in a public meeting was 0.76 (n = 48, SD = 0.75), which was 0.15 higher than at Time 1. Residents reported mixed levels of interest in local politics, with 27.5% (n = 14) reporting a lot, 9.8% (n = 5)

reporting some, 5.9% (n = 3) reporting a little, and 29.4% (n = 15) reporting no interest at all, while 27.5% (n = 14) were unsure. The average scores for interest in local politics were higher by 0.05 in the Time 2 measure (n = 36, M = 1.49, SD = 1.37). When asked if they had served as an officer or served on a committee of any local or neighborhood clubs, religious or school-related organizations in the past six months, the majority (77.6%, n = 38) reported they had not. The average score for service to neighborhood organizations was unchanged from Time 1 to Time 2. The final question regarding civic engagement revealed 61.8% (n = 34) of residents and members of their household have not ever talked to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement, which was slightly higher by 0.01 than at Time 1.

Table 18: Descriptive Statistics on Key Variables (Time 2 Survey) – CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Volunteered or helped in community (n=53)	Never	21	(39.6)	1.12	1.15
	Once or twice	11	(20.8)		
	Once a month	9	(17.0)		
	Once a week or more	9	(17.0)		
	Not sure	3	(5.6)		
Attended public meeting (n=52)	Never	20	(38.5)	.755	.751
	Once or twice	22	(42.3)		
	Once a month	6	(11.5)		
	Once a week or more	1	(1.9)		
	Not sure	3	(5.8)		

(Table 18 continued)

Key Variables		n=59	(%)	M	SD
Interested in local politics (n=51)	Not at all	15	(29.4)	1.49	1.37
	A little	3	(5.9)		
	Some	5	(9.8)		
	A lot	14	(27.5)		
	Not sure	14	(27.5)		
Served on committee (n=49)	No	38	(77.6)	.225	.422
	Yes	11	(22.4)		
Talked to political official (n=56)	No	34	(60.7)	.393	.493
	Yes	22	(39.3)		
TOTAL CIVIC ENGAGEMENT (n = 57) Minimum = .00; Maximum = 3.00				1.00	.825

Note. "Not sure" data were coded as "9," missing data coded as "-99," and neither "9s" nor "-99s" was included in mean scores.

Resident responses were captured at Time 2 for other key variables of interest, including openness to transformation, ability to impact the civic economy, and collaborative activities for neighborhood improvements. When residents were asked in the Time 2 Survey to think about the future of the neighborhood over the next five years, 58.7% (n = 17) stated they felt it would change for the better, 17.2% (n = 5) said it would stay the same, and 24.1% (n = 7) stated they though it would change for the worse. These results indicated a slightly lower average score

(0.05) in openness to transformation from Time 1 results to Time 2 results (n = 29, M = 1.35, SD = 0.86). Eighty-one percent (n = 35) of residents reported they felt they had the ability to improve or make decisions that affect their neighborhood; the mean score for civic economy (n = 42, M = 0.81, SD = 0.39) was slightly higher at Time 2 than at Time 1, by 0.05. Residents were asked if they had ever gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize a neighborhood improvement, to which 62.5% (n = 35) responded no, a difference in mean scores of 0.01 from Time 1 to Time 2 measures. The change from Time 1 to Time 2 average scores for connectedness to neighbors was slightly higher, by 0.04; the Time 2 average was 1.73 (n = 55, SD = 1.01). Over half of the resident participants (54.6%, n = 30) at Time 2 reported feeling either very close or close to their neighbors.

Table 19: Descriptive Statistics on Other Key Variables (Time 2 Survey)

Key Variables		n = 59	(%)	M	SD
Openness to transformation (n=29)	Change for the better	17	(58.7)	1.35	.857
	Stay the same	5	(17.2)		
	Change for the worse	7	(24.1)		
Contribution to civic economy (n=43)	Yes	35	(81.4)	.814	.394
	No	8	(18.6)		

(Table 19 continued)

Key Variables		n = 59	(%)	M	SD
Collaborated with neighbors (n=56)	Yes	21	(37.5)	.375	.489
	No	35	(62.5)		
Connectedness to neighbors (n=55)	Not close at all	6	(10.9)	1.69	1.03
	Somewhat close	19	(34.5)		
	Close	14	(25.5)		
	Very close	16	(29.1)		

Analysis of Data

Research Question Two

The second research objective examined the dimensions of social capital in relation to one another and the variance of social capital dimensions with regard to participant demographic characteristics using data from the pre-planning survey. Research Question Two: Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people?

H_1: Trust, Social Cohesion, Reciprocal Relationships, Social Ties, and Civic Engagement are positively correlated.

H_2-H_6: Individuals who are non-homeowners, lower income, lower educational attainment, unmarried, younger and shorter-term residents have lower levels of Trust, Civic Engagement, Social Cohesion, Reciprocal Relationships and Social Ties.

Objective One: Bivariate Analyses of Interrelationships. In order to explore the strength of linear relationships among the dimensions of social capital, ten correlations were computed among the Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Reciprocal Relationships, Total Social Ties, and Total Civic Engagement variables. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to assess the significance, direction and strength of associations between each total dimension of social capital.

For Total Trust, significant, positive correlations were found with Total Civic Engagement ($r(211) = .15$, $p = .032$), Total Social Cohesion ($r(214) = .38$, $p < .001$), and Total Reciprocal Relationships ($r(178) = .35$, $p < .001$). The correlation between Total Trust and Total Social Ties ($r(178) = .08$, $p = .261$) was non-signficant. Other significant, positive correlations for Total Civic Engagement included Total Social Cohesion ($r(210) = .25$, $p < .001$), Total Reciprocal Relationships ($r(176) = .18$, $p = .016$), and Total Social Ties ($r(178) = .21$, $p = .006$). The correlation between social cohesion and reciprocal relationships was statistically significant, as Total Social Cohesion was positively correlated with Total Reciprocal Relationships ($r(179) = .32$, $p < .001$). There was no significant correlation between Total Social Cohesion and Total Social Ties ($r(178) = .15$, $p = .053$), however, there was a statistically significant, positive correlation between Total Reciprocal Relationships and Total Social Ties ($r(179) = .25$, $p = .001$). Overall, there were strong, statistically significant, positive correlations between all total dimensions of social capital with the exception of Trust and Social Ties, and Social Ties and Reciprocal Relationships. The following correlation matrix (Table 20) details the findings of interrelationships among the social capital measures.

Table 20. Correlations Between Total Social Capital Measures

	Social Cohesion	Reciprocal Relationships	Social Ties	Civic Engagement
Trust	0.380**	0.352**	0.084	0.147*
(n)	(214)	(178)	(178)	(211)
Social Cohesion		0.320**	0.145	0.246**
(n)		(179)	(178)	(210)
Reciprocal Relationships			0.246**	0.180*
(n)			(179)	(176)
Social Ties				0.206**
(n)				(178)

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01

Objective Two: Multiple Regression. Multiple regression models were used to examine the relationships between demographic attributes and the dimensions of social capital. Five different models were created with the predictor values of marital status, homeowner status, level of educational attainment, and length of time in the neighborhood. Additionally, gender was examined. Race/ethnicity was not included in the OLS equation as there was minimal variability in this category. Similarly, income was not included due to the limited variability and high instance of missing data in this category. These models explored the following outcome variables: Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Civic Engagement, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and Total Social Ties. Total social capital dimensions were measured at the ratio level with scores that ranged from 0 to 3. The predictor variables (age, gender, homeowner status, marital status, educational level, and time in neighborhood) were entered into regression models predicting the five dimensions of social capital (trust, social cohesion, civic engagement, reciprocal relationships, and social ties). Four of the five models were not found to be significant, including Total Trust ($F(6, 125) = 1.35$, $p = .242$), Total Social Cohesion ($F(6, 124) = 1.87$, $p =$

.092), Total Reciprocal Relationships (F(6, 95) = 0.45, p = .843), and Total Social Ties (F(6, 96) = 0.44, p = .850).

The results of the Total Civic Engagement regression indicated the model was significant, $F(6, 128) = 3.26$, $p < .005$, and accounted for 10% of the variance in Total Civic Engagement scores (adjusted $R^2 = .10$), with a small effect size ($f^2 = 0.11$). Homeowner status was found to be a significant, unique predictor of Total Civic Engagement.

Table 21. OLS Regression Analysis Predicting Total Civic Engagement (Time 1)

Variable	B	*SE* B	β	t	Sig.
Homeowner Status	0.35	0.16	0.22	2.25	.027*
Gender	0.08	0.15	0.04	0.52	.603
Educational Level	0.18	0.10	0.17	1.77	.079
Marital Status	0.07	0.16	0.04	0.45	.657
Time in Neighborhood	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.18	.858
Age	0.01	0.00	0.17	1.82	.072

Note. $R^2 = .14$, Adj. $R^2 = .10$, *p < .05, n = 128.

These findings revealed that residents who owned homes were likely to report a higher level of civic engagement than non-home owners. Table 22 includes the tolerance and VIF statistics. Tolerance for all variables exceeds 0.1, and the mean VIF of 1.21 indicated multicollinearity was not considered to be an issue in this model.

Table 22. Multicollinearity Analysis for Research Question 2 Variables

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Homeowner Status	0.734	1.362
Gender	0.985	1.015

(Table 22 continued)

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Educational Level	0.816	1.226
Marital Status	0.941	1.063
Time in Neighborhood	0.722	1.385
Age	0.810	1.235

Note. Mean VIF = 1.21; n = 128.

Research Question Three

The third research question was interested in examining the association between the perception of social capital and openness to transformation. Specifically, Research Question Three asked: Are residents' perceptions of social capital related to their openness to transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?

H_1: Levels of social capital (trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, reciprocal relationships and social ties) are positive predictors of the degree of openness to neighborhood transformation.

Data Analysis Method: Binomial Logistic Regression. To explore this research question, logistic regression models were computed using Time 1 scores of Total Trust, Total Civic Engagement, Total Social Cohesion, Total Reciprocal Relationships and Total Social Ties with Openness to Transformation (optimism for the future), which was recoded as a dichotomous outcome variable (0 = change for the worse or stay the same, and 1 = change for the better). Forward logistic regression was conducted to determine which demographic independent variables were included in the models. Logistic regression results revealed the overall model of eight predictor variables (Total Trust, Total Civic Engagement, Total Social Cohesion, Total Social Ties, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and education) in predicting openness to

transformation was statistically different than the null hypothesis (-2 Log Likelihood = 95.21; X^2 = 5.55, p = .037). Nagelkerke's pseudo-R^2 was 0.227. Of the eight predictor variables included in the model, only one variable was found to be statistically significant in predicting openness to transformation, Total Civic Engagement (OR=2.22, p < .05). A positive relationship was found, whereas for each one-unit increase in the Total Civic Engagement score, there was a 122% higher odds of being open to transformation. This finding indicates that the more civically engaged a resident is, the greater the likelihood (s)he will be open to transformation.

Table 23. Logistic Regression Estimates for a Model Predicting Openness to Transformation

Predictor Variable	*B*	Wald X^2	*p*	Odds Ratio
Total Trust	0.47	2.05	.152	1.61
Total Civic Engagement	0.80	4.10	.043*	2.22
Total Social Cohesion	0.24	0.35	.555	1.27
Total Social Ties	-0.23	0.48	.487	0.80
Total Reciprocal Relationships	0.46	1.38	.240	1.59
Educational Attainment				
Less than HS degree	-1.37	2.56	.110	0.25
HS degree/Equiv.	-1.66	3.58	.059	0.19
Some college or more	-0.93	0.59	.442	0.40

Note. n = 80; *p<.05; All data Time 1.

Table 24 includes the tolerance and VIF statistics. Tolerance for all variables exceeds 0.1, and the mean VIF of 1.15, indicating multicollinearity is not considered to be an issue in this model.

Table 24. Multicollinearity Analysis for Research Question 3 Variables

Variable	Tolerance	VIF
Total Trust	0.797	1.254
Total Civic Engagement	0.876	1.141
Total Social Cohesion	0.828	1.208
Total Social Ties	0.893	1.120
Total Reciprocal Relationships	0.889	1.125
Educational Attainment	0.949	1.054

Note. Mean VIF = 1.15; n = 80.

Research Question Four

The fourth research objective asked: Are residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, social services and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they can contribute to their civic economy? This question sought to identify significant associations in the relationships between access to health care, adult education opportunities, quality housing and affordable housing and the participants' perceived ability to contribute to their neighborhood's civic economy.

H_1: Residents who perceive they have access to health care, education, and/or housing opportunities are more likely to believe they can contribute to their civic economy.

Data Analysis Method: Chi-Square & Binomial Logistic Regression. A one-sample chi-square analysis of Time 1 Survey responses was conducted to identify associations between satisfaction with access to health care, housing, and education with respondents' belief in their ability to contribute to the civic economy. The results of the tests were not significant: (a) health care, $X^2(3, 131) = 3.72$, $p = .293$; (b) affordable housing, $X^2(3, 129) = 2.35$, $p = .503$; (c) quality

housing, $X^2(3, 128) = 3.13$, $p = .372$; and (d) education and training, $X^2(3, 93) = 3.72$, $p = .293$). Although no statistically significant findings were revealed among groups with varying levels of satisfaction with access, Table 25 shows relatively high levels of perceived ability to contribute to the civic economy across all levels of satisfaction with access for each of the variables of interest.

Table 25. Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square Analyses of Access related to Civic Economy

	Civic Economy			
Variable of Access	Do not have ability to contribute n (%)	Have ability to contribute n (%)	X^2	p
Health Care			3.72	.293
Very dissatisfied	11 (28.2)	28 (71.8)		
Dissatisfied	4 (18.2)	18 (81.8)		
Satisfied	11 (28.2)	18 (71.8)		
Very satisfied	4 (12.1)	29 (87.9)		
Affordable Housing			2.35	.503
Very dissatisfied	12 (26.1)	34 (73.9)		
Dissatisfied	9 (27.3)	24 (72.7)		
Satisfied	6 (21.4)	22 (78.6)		
Very satisfied	3 (12.0)	22 (88.0)		
Quality Housing			3.13	.372
Very dissatisfied	12 (23.1)	40 (76.9)		
Dissatisfied	11 (31.4)	24 (68.6)		

(Table 25 continued)

	Civic Economy			
Variable of Access	Do not have ability to contribute n (%)	Have ability to contribute n (%)	X^2	p
Quality Housing			3.13	.372
Satisfied	5 (20.8)	19 (79.2)		
Very satisfied	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)		
Education and Training			3.72	.293
Very dissatisfied	9 (24.3)	28 (75.7)		
Dissatisfied	5 (25.0)	15 (75.0)		
Satisfied	1 (5.3)	18 (94.7)		
Very satisfied	3 (15.0)	17 (85.0)		

Bivariate analyses between the civic economy, access, and demographic attributes revealed no statistically significant relationships between access and civic economy, however, a statistically significant, positive relationship was found between homeowner status and civic economy ($r(130) = .197$, $p = .023$). Logistic regression models were computed to further examine the dynamics of civic economy and variables of access, while controlling for demographic variables. The criterion variable of civic economy was loaded into the model, along with the predictor variables of access to health care, education, quality housing and affordable housing, and owner status. No significant models were found.

Research Question Five

The fifth research objective aimed to understand the impact of the Choice Neighborhood planning process on the overall social capital and dimensions of social capital reported by residents. Specifically, this question asked: How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents?

H_1: Levels of social capital will be higher in the posttest than at the baseline.

Data Analysis Method: Paired Sample T-tests for Mean Differences. To understand the extent of change in residents' perceptions of social capital increase after a year of involvement in the Choice Neighborhood planning process, paired-samples t-tests for differences were conducted comparing Time 1 total score means for the dimensions of reported social capital measures to Time 2 total score means for dimensions of social capital measures. There was not a significant difference between the scores for Total Social Capital at the pre-test (M = 1.50, SD = 0.45) and post-level (M = 1.57, SD = 0.48); $t(54) = 0.90$, p = .374. Table 26 details the paired-sample t-test analyses for all social capital measures.

Table 26. Paired-Samples T-Tests between Time 1 and Time 2 Measures for Total Social Capital

		Time 1		Time 2			
	n	M	SD	M	SD	*t*	*p*
Social Capital	55	1.50	0.45	1.57	0.48	0.97	.335
Trust	53	1.52	0.85	1.74	0.76	1.94	.058
Social Cohesion	52	1.99	0.79	2.11	0.80	0.89	.378
Reciprocal Rel.	43	1.97	0.60	1.76	0.70	-1.65	.107
Civic Eng.	53	1.10	0.90	1.01	0.84	-0.64	.522
Social Ties	43	1.04	0.69	1.20	0.72	1.23	.224

Research Question Six

The final research question asked: Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration predict higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships? The objective of this question was to understand if civic engagement and collaboration were predictors of higher levels of reported social capital dimensions.

H_1: Civic engagement and collaboration are positive predictors of higher levels of trust, social cohesion, social ties, and reciprocal relationships.

Data Analysis Method: Bivariate Analyses of Interrelationships. To explore this research question, residualized gain scores were computed for Total Civic Engagement and Collaboration at time 1 (pre-test) vs. time 2 (post-test). Bivariate analyses of interrelationships were explored using the residualized gain scores of Total Civic Engagement and Collaboration with Time 2 scores of Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and Total Social Ties.

Ten Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to assess the direction, strength and significance of associations between the variables. It was hypothesized that gaining in civic engagement and collaboration across the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys relative to the group would correlate with having higher scores in Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Social Ties, and Total Reciprocal Relationships at Time 2. Additionally, relationships between Time 2 Total Civic Engagement and Total Social Capital with collaboration residualized gain scores were explored. Positive correlations were revealed for civic engagement and Time 2 Total Social Cohesion ($r(50) = .31$, $p = .027$), and Time 2 Total Social Ties ($r(50) = .30$, $p = .030$). There were no significant correlations found between civic engagement and Time 2 Total Trust ($r(50) = .146$, $p = .301$) or Total Reciprocal Relationships ($r(51) = .183$, $p = .190$).

Three statistically significant correlations were revealed with Time 2 social capital dimensions and collaboration (all *p*s < .01). Collaboration was positively correlated with Total Reciprocal Relationships ($r(36) = .441$, $p = .006$), Total Civic Engagement ($r(36) = .469$, $p = .003$), and Total Social Capital ($r(36) = .468$, $p = .003$). No significant correlations were revealed for collaboration with Total Trust ($r(35) = .216$, $p = .198$), Total Social Cohesion ($r(35) = .297$, $p = .074$), or Total Social Ties ($r(35) = .013$, $p = .939$). The following correlation matrix (Table 27) details the findings of interrelationships among the Time 2 social capital measures and residualized gain scores for collaboration and civic engagement.

Table 27. Correlations for Social Capital Scores (Time 2), Collaboration and Civic Engagement

	TSC	TCE	TT	TSCoh	TST	TRR
Collaboration	.468**	.469**	.216	.297	.013	.441**
n	38	38	37	37	37	38
Civic Engagement			.146	.307*	.302*	.183
n			52	52	52	53

Note. TSC = Total Social Capital; TCE = Total Civic Engagement; TT = Total Trust; TSCoh = Total Social Cohesion; TST = Total Social Ties; TRR = Total Reciprocal Relationships; *p<.05, **p<.01.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to further understand the associations among neighborhood revitalization planning, social capital, and residents' readiness for transformation. To accomplish this goal, the research questions were developed based on a review of the previous literature related to this topic, and input from community leaders, community residents and other community stakeholders. This chapter described the results of the analyses for each of the six research questions.

The first question involved the collection and analysis of qualitative data from focus groups and a previous plan related to the community targeted for a Choice Neighborhood planning process. Results revealed seven themes related to social capital and neighborhood transformation, which included: (1) trust; (2) access; (3) civic economy and empowerment; (4) engagement and participation; (5) collaboration and community building; (6) connectedness and cohesion; and (7) openness to transformation. These themes were used to inform the selection of social capital measures and in the overall development of the household-level survey instrument.

The second question examined socio-demographic variables as predictors of the five dimensions of social capital, which included trust, social ties, social cohesion, reciprocal relationships, and civic engagement. The first objective of this research question examined correlations between the social capital dimensions. Overall, statistically significant, positive relationships were found among all total dimensions of social capital with the exceptions of Total Trust and Total Social Ties, and Total Social Ties and Total Reciprocal Relationships.

The second part of this research question involved the utilization of OLS regression to examine the relationships between demographic attributes and the dimensions of social capital. Five different models were created with the predictor values of marital status, homeowner status, level of educational attainment, and length of time in the neighborhood. Additionally, gender was examined. These models explored the following outcome variables: Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Civic Engagement, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and Total Social Ties. Four of the five models were not found to be significant, including Total Trust, Total Social Cohesion, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and Total Social Ties. The results of the Total Civic Engagement regression indicated the model was significant, and homeowner status was found to be a significant, unique predictor of Total Civic Engagement.

The third research question posited that the dimensions of social capital were positive predictors of openness to neighborhood transformation. Regression results revealed the overall model of eight predictor variables (Total Trust, Total Civic Engagement, Total Social Cohesion, Total Social Ties, Total Reciprocal Relationships, and education) was statistically reliable in predicting openness to transformation. Of the eight predictor variables included in the model, only one variable was found to be statistically significant in predicting openness to transformation, Total Civic Engagement. This finding indicated that the more civically engaged a resident was, the greater the likelihood (s)he was optimistic about the future.

The fourth research question used chi-square analyses and logistic regression to examine perceived satisfaction with access to health care, education, and housing opportunities and associated belief in one's ability to contribute to their neighborhood's civic economy at Time 1. No statistically significant findings were revealed, however, residents reported a high level of perceived ability to contribute to their civic economy across all levels of satisfaction with access to health care, education and housing. Through bivariate analyses of civic economy, variables of access, and variables of demographic attributes, a statistically significant, positive correlation was found between homeowner status and belief in one's ability to impact their civic economy.

The fifth research question sought to identify gains in social capital reported by residents using paired-sample t-tests for differences from the initiation of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative and the follow-up one year later. Time 1 mean scores for totals of each dimension of social capital were compared with Time 2 mean scores, and a Total Social Capital measure was calculated for the Time 1 and Time 2 scores, averaging the total scores from the five social capital dimensions. No significant differences were found from Time 1 to Time 2 between the mean scores for the five total social capital dimensions (Total Trust, Total

Civic Engagement, Total Reciprocal Relationships, Total Social Ties, and Total Social Cohesion) or at the individual levels of total dimensions of social capital (Total Social Capital).

The sixth and final research question revealed that civic engagement residualized gain scores were positively correlated with Total Social Ties and Total Social Cohesion (all *p*s < .05). Regarding collaboration, results revealed gains in collaboration across the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys relative to the group were positively associated with Total Reciprocal Relationships, Total Civic Engagement, and Total Social Capital (all *p*s < .01).

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Relationships between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital were examined in this study, along with the associations of those constructs with collaboration and openness to transformation. The purpose of this research was to gain insight into the climate of the civic economy and influence of resident engagement in a community planning process in the neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights, the focus of a FY2010 HUD-funded Choice Neighborhood planning initiative in Shreveport, Louisiana. This included examining the cognitive and structured social capital perceived by neighborhood residents on the following five dimensions: trust, reciprocal relationships, social cohesion, social ties and civic engagement. This chapter discusses findings from each of the six research questions, the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, implications for practice and policy in social work and community development, and study conclusions. The findings for each research question are introduced by a quote captured in the focus groups with residents that is related to the discussion that follows.

Discussion of Findings

Research Question One

"The lack of trust in the neighborhood is a threat."

The first research question examined residents' perceptions and lived experiences of trust and related social capital concepts in order to inform the development of the community survey instrument. Findings from focus groups and a content analysis of a previous planning effort in the neighborhood revealed seven themes related to social capital and neighborhood transformation, which included: (1) trust; (2) access; (3) civic economy and empowerment; (4)

engagement and participation; (5) collaboration and community building; (6) connectedness and cohesion; and (7) openness to transformation. Three primary themes related to trust emerged through the qualitative analysis, including trust within the neighborhood, trust with police in the neighborhood, and trust with local government. Participants expressed the importance of building trust and relationships within the community in order to facilitate readiness for transformation. Participants shared feelings of disempowerment and a lack of hope in the future, and concern as to whether they would have a voice in the planning process. “Don’t do ‘to’ the community, do ‘with’ and ‘for’ the community,” was a message shared by one participant that conveyed the collective desire for meaningful inclusion and an equal partnership in community transformation.

Figure 2. Word Cloud from Focus Group Transcripts

If given the opportunity to participate in the planning process, participants expressed concern as to whether residents in need of the services and supports associated with the transformation would be motivated to become involved. Participants discussed access to services

and amenities as an important consideration for neighborhood transformation planning, and described access to health care, access to job training and adult education, and access to quality and affordable housing as community needs. Participants were mixed in their views as to how optimistic they were about the likelihood of transformation in their neighborhood in the near future, and many reported the belief that the neighborhood would continue to decline, others felt it would stay the same, and some vocalized optimism that it would change for the better.

The findings of this research question informed the development of the survey instrument. Questions related to access, trust, social cohesion, social ties, reciprocal relationships, civic engagement, ability to contribute to the civic economy, and openness to transformation were framed from and selected for inclusion in the community assessment survey that was developed as part of the larger project. Leadership from the Choice Neighborhood partnership, including residents of the community of interest, collaborated with the researcher in determining the content of the survey and framing of the questions. The decisions related to the development of the survey were guided by the findings from the focus groups. Data gathered through the household level surveys was used to examine research questions two through six.

Research Question Two

"A neighborhood is much more than the homes within its borders."

The second question examined associations among the social capital dimensions and the socio-demographic variables as predictors of the five dimensions of social capital. The social capital dimensions of trust, civic engagement, social cohesion, and reciprocal relationships were all found to have strong, positive associations among one another. For example, residents that reported higher levels of trust were more likely to also report higher levels of civic engagement, social cohesion, and reciprocal relationships. The social capital dimension of social ties was

found to be significantly and positively associated with social cohesion and civic engagement. The strongest correlations existed between trust and social cohesion, trust and reciprocal relationships, social cohesion and reciprocal relationships, social cohesion and civic engagement, social ties and civic engagement, and social ties and reciprocal relationships. These results revealed that for participants in the study, higher levels of trust were associated with higher degrees of connectedness with the community overall, as well as a higher degree of frequency of reciprocal exchanges with family and friends. This could be interpreted to mean that the more connected residents' felt to their neighbors, the more likely they were to report a higher level of trust and reciprocal exchanges with family and friends. The higher their level of reciprocal relationships, the greater the extent of their social ties, trust, sense of cohesion with neighbors, and level of involvement and engagement in community activities. Those residents with a high level of civic engagement reported experiences of higher trust, cohesion with neighbors, reciprocal exchanges, and social ties. The exception to the significant associations among social capital dimensions was social ties, which was found to have positive but non-significant associations with trust or reciprocal relationships.

"A lot of them think they don't have a voice. And it's not worth me coming."

The second part of this research question examined relationships between demographic attributes (gender, age, homeowner status, marital status, educational attainment, and length of time living in the neighborhood) and the five dimensions of social capital. The results revealed that homeowner status was a significant, unique predictor of civic engagement, when controlling for the other demographic attributes. Those that reported owning homes in the neighborhood may be more committed to remaining in the neighborhood for the long term, and therefore more active in their neighborhood associations. Previous research has found that homeowners are

more active politically and civically in their communities than non-homeowners (DiPasquale & Glaeser, 1999; Manturuk, Lindblad, & Quercia, 2009). Homeowners may feel more connected and committed to their neighborhood, and therefore more inclined to be actively involved. Owning a home was a positive predictor of attending public meetings more frequently, expressing greater interest in local politics, and volunteering and serving more regularly in community associations. Homeownership predicted a greater likelihood to talk to political officials about neighborhood problems. Homeowners may feel they have a stronger voice when it comes to neighborhood affairs because they perceive they have a legitimate stake in the community. Scholars have suggested that homeownership may induce a psychological sense of attachment to community (Rotolo, Wilson, & Hughes, 2010).

Though the income variable proved unusable based on the high number of participants who chose not to respond, homeowner status could be considered an inexact approximation for relative prosperity. For those that reported income (n=117), bivariate analysis revealed homeowner status was significantly and positively correlated with income (p = .000018). Therefore, the findings that indicated homeowners were more likely to be civically engaged could be reflective of relative class differences. Previous research has shown that socio-economic status is related to higher levels of trust, and homeownership has been associated with higher levels of trust among neighbors (McCabe, 2012). Social class stratification in the neighborhood could impact levels of civic engagement.

Bivariate analyses revealed positive associations between two social capital variables with demographic attributes: trust and age, and civic engagement and educational attainment. Age was a strong, positive predictor of total trust, such as the older a resident was, the higher the level of trust. Similar to the findings of Schwadel and Stout (2012), who reported that age had a

positive, linear effect on attitudes of trust, this finding demonstrated that residents who are older are more likely trusting of others, police, local government than those who are younger. Perhaps residents who are older have lived in the community longer, and have developed stronger relationships with others in their neighborhood, local government and their neighborhood police. Perhaps they have been exposed to a deeper and wider array of opportunities to develop trust in their community than their younger resident counterparts.

Education was found to be strongly associated with civic engagement, indicating that higher educational attainment was positively related to proclivity for involvement in neighborhood associations and community affairs. Education has been described as "one of the most important predictors . . . of many forms of political and social engagement" (Helliwell & Putnam, 1999, p.1). One way to understand this finding could be that residents who have pursued a post-secondary degree have experienced wider exposure to opportunities for civic involvement through educational settings outside of the neighborhood, which may have helped to prepare them for, or become more open to, involvement in civic activity in their community. Another explanation is that as education increases so does socio-economic status, as scholars have suggested leads to increases in civic engagement (Campbell, 2006).

Research Question Three

"We have to share with the younger generations the legacy that was once here, the history. At one point in time it was the community of choice to live. And it can return to that."

The third research question examined whether or not residents who reported higher scores on the dimensions of social capital would be more optimistic about neighborhood transformation. The analysis revealed that only one dimension of social capital – civic engagement – was a significant positive predictor of optimism about the future. This finding

reflects the sentiments shared through the focus group conversations, which were that civic engagement was connected to commitment and empowerment, and that it was up to the residents to get involved and rebuild their community if change was going to be meaningful. This finding leads to the question of how these constructs impact one another – specifically, whether residents who are optimistic about the future are led to become more engaged in their community, or whether being engaged in community activities can lead to optimism about the future.

A concern shared in the focus groups was that many residents did not feel they had a voice or that local government was committed to following through with plans to improve their community – that there were too many broken promises and abandoned commitments from the past. The concepts of civic engagement and lived experience of trust by residents in the neighborhood were strongly correlated, and through the qualitative assessment these concepts seemed closely connected to their feelings of having their voice heard, being a partner at the table, having a role in the revitalization planning, and holding outsiders accountable to following through on action that was meaningful to residents to transform their neighborhood. One resident described a "spirit of hopelessness" in the community, which appeared closely related to feelings of disempowerment and mistrust. It was also emphasized in the focus group conversations that trust needed to be built and repaired, in order for residents to start to believe that change was possible, in order to be motivated to become engaged civically and for the community to thrive.

Research Question Four

"I've seen this neighborhood going from good to, you know, now it's pretty much kind of bad – it's kind of up to us to do whatever it takes to help it get back where it was or even better than what it is."

The fourth research question examined satisfaction with access to health care, education, and housing opportunities and an individual's belief in their own ability to contribute to their neighborhood's civic economy. The findings of this question that examined the residents' perceptions of access with ability to contribute to the civic economy were not statistically significant. Although no statistically significant findings were revealed, there was a high degree of perceived ability to contribute to the civic economy across all levels of satisfaction with the dimensions of access. Of those residents (n=190) that answered this survey question, three out of four agreed they believed they had the ability to improve or make decisions that impact their neighborhood. These findings are particularly interesting given that nearly half of all respondents did not believe that the neighborhood would improve over the next five years, and perceptions of disempowerment was a persistent theme in the qualitative analysis.

The behavioral component of community empowerment has been described as the "readiness, willingness, and capacity of a community to get things done for the collective good" (Aiyer et al., 2015, p. 142; Zimmerman, 2000). Bivariate analyses of civic economy with demographic attributes revealed a statistically significant, positive correlation between homeowner status and belief in one's ability to impact their civic economy. As mentioned previously, homeowner status was found to be significantly and positively correlated with income, and additionally with education and length of time living in the neighborhood. If homeownership in this study is considered an indicator of economic prosperity, and poverty triggers feelings of disempowerment (Dean, 1992), perhaps homeowners are more inclined than non-homeowners to believe they have the power to make an impact in their neighborhood.

Research Question Five

"They have got to come together for a purpose. All the people that's connected. I know it can happen."

The fifth research question sought to identify whether or not there were gains in social capital reported by residents from the time of the initiation of the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood planning initiative to the follow-up one-year later. Though the mean scores were slightly higher in the Time 2 survey for overall social capital and the various dimensions of social capital (with the exception of reciprocal relationships and civic engagement), no significant differences were found. These findings were not unexpected, as social capital is unlikely to change significantly over a time period of one year (R. Putnam, 2012, personal communication).

Research Question Six

"We need to get people to realize that the only power to change the neighborhood is held by them."

The findings of question six revealed that gains in civic engagement across the one-year span of the study predicted higher scores in social ties and social cohesion. Gains in collaboration positively predicted reciprocal relationships, civic engagement and social capital. The strongest of these associations involved collaboration, with both social capital dimensions and the overall social capital measure. Collaboration and civic engagement gains were also found to be strongly and positively correlated.

Participants reporting increases in involvement and frequency of involvement in civic activities – volunteerism, membership in community organizations and associations, attending public meetings, and talking with political leadership about community concerns – were more

likely to achieve increases in diversity of social ties and connections, and to express a greater sense of cohesion within their neighborhood. The concept of *social ties* has been found to be closely associated with *collective efficacy*, and collective efficacy has been described as a construct that "characterizes a neighborhood's readiness for social action" (Aiyer et al., 2015, p. 140). Though collective efficacy was not specifically examined in this study, the social cohesion measure used in this study was a subscale from a larger collective efficacy scale (Sampson et al., 1997). This finding demonstrates that increases in civic engagement positively predict increases in social ties and social cohesion, which could mean civic engagement is an important indicator of readiness for collective action leading to transformation.

Gains in civic engagement were also found to be closely associated with increases in collaborative action. As the civic economy is concerned with building sustainable communities that result in collective prosperity with an emphasis on culture and collaboration (Conway & Murphy, 2012), these findings indicate gains in collaboration could lead to strengthening the civic economy, through gains in reciprocal exchanges, increased civic activity, and overall social capital. Participants who reported a higher level of collaborative activity across the year of the study were more likely to be engaged in neighborhood affairs, and to experience gains in overall social capital. Collaboration measured whether or not neighbors had worked with other neighbors to improve their community. It could be said that when neighbors collaborate with one another to make a difference in their neighborhood, the neighborhood benefits, as does the neighbor. Collaboration builds relationships, which are the 'resources' or 'goods' that characterize social capital. Relationships are the foundation for building trust, and can open doors to opportunity.

Limitations of the Study

Like most neighborhood studies, this study utilized a non-experimental research design, which limits causal inference (Small & Newman, 2001). The researcher could examine the existence of associations between and among social capital dimensions and other concepts, and the strength of those relationships, but little else. The neighborhood-level context does not lend itself readily to experimental research designs such as randomized controlled trials (RCT), and many community-level studies that have used RCT have resulted in questionable and inconsistent outcomes (Beehler, 2011). An improvement on this design would be to compare those households involved in a community planning project with those households within the same community who are not involved, in order to aid in isolating the effects of the intervention from external factors that could have contributed to or have been responsible for any subsequent findings related to changes in social capital.

As this study was part of a larger Choice Neighborhoods project, members of the target community and leadership from the Choice Neighborhood were involved in framing the survey instrument, which helped to capture data the community felt was most relevant. Measurement error occurs when survey questions are not easily understood by participants (Salant & Dillman, 1994), and as residents and community partners provided meaningful input into the design of the survey instrument, a benefit of the community-engaged process was a reduction in the potential for measurement error. However, community-level research designed in joint partnership between the researcher and the community has both benefits and costs (Anderson-Butcher et al., 2015). The community-engaged process for the development of the survey instrument resulted in the adaptation of - and in many cases the elimination of - questions from previously validated scales, therefore lessening the rigor of the research by risking their psychometric properties.

Additionally, members from the target community and collaborative leadership were involved in determining the survey sampling approach, and when it became clear that the randomized telephone survey was not a viable option, project leadership and community members felt it was important to make an effort to reach every household in the neighborhood through door to door canvassing, rather than using a random sampling strategy.

Despite making efforts to reach every household in the neighborhood on multiple occasions through multiple means, the limited size of the sample is another important concern. The findings may not accurately represent the larger neighborhood, and generalizability outside the parameters of this neighborhood is questionable. Coverage error could have been a concern of the survey design as although multiple attempts were made to reach households at varying times and days of the week, it is not clear whether or not every household in the community had an equal chance of inclusion in the sample (Salant & Dillman, 1994). To address this, surveys were mailed to and/or left at households after the third in-person surveying attempt with pre-paid return envelopes, but as illiteracy was a neighborhood concern frequently cited in the focus groups, there may have been many residents unable to participate through mail.

A large percentage of participants identified as homeowners (42.4%), when compared to those that identified as renters (32.2%) and those that chose not to answer (25.4%). As discussed elsewhere in this chapter, it is possible that homeowners were more inclined to participate in the survey as they felt a stronger sense of commitment to and investment in the neighborhood. The number of homeowners in the sample could have skewed the findings, but this is difficult to ascertain as one out of every five respondents declined to identify themselves as either homeowners or renters.

Sampling error was less of a concern with the Time 1 Survey, as 188 is the completed sample size needed for a survey population of 800 at the 80/20 split with a margin of error ±5% (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009), and 236 surveys were completed. However, sampling error for the Time 2 Survey was problematic, with only 59 surveys completed, this did not meet the minimum threshold for an 80/20 split of ±5%, which would have been closer to 100 (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009). Residents from the community of interest and students from local universities were involved in the administration of the survey and supervision of surveyors, and although they were provided training, there were a number of Time 1 Surveys that were not matched to addresses, and therefore were not identifiable for participation in the Time 2 Survey. The limited context for follow-up, combined with the transient nature of the neighborhood could have contributed to the low number of completed Time 2 Surveys.

Another key limitation of this study was the length of time between the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys. The Choice Neighborhood planning initiative had been initiated exactly one year prior to the post-survey, and it is unusual to detect any substantial or significant gains in social capital within such a short time frame (Putnam, personal communication, 2012).

Inter-correlations among social capital variables were also a potential concern of note, as the data for the study came from a single source. It is possible that these correlations had more to do with personal characteristics or personality temperaments of the participants than with the substantive issues of interest for this study. For example, participants with sunny dispositions or in good health may have been more likely to report positive perceptions in general.

In addition to these concerns, participation in the study was voluntary, and the data that were collected were self-reported. This leads to concerns as to whether or not the participants' responses were honest and accurate. Neighborhood residents and university students participated

as door-to-door surveyors, and though this is considered an important strength of this study, response bias may have led some participants to offer what they perceived as socially desirable answers rather than truthful responses. Out of respect for the privacy of residents and regarding the voluntary nature of their involvement - a basic ethical norm in survey research (Salant & Dillman, 1994) - participants had the option to skip questions they did not wish to answer, which resulted in a large amount of missing data in some cases. As the Time 1 Survey was lengthy and took approximately 45 minutes to complete, some participants may have selected the "unsure" or "I prefer not to answer" options to get through the survey faster, rather than think through their response to questions that were more personal or complex to answer. As several questions had a high percentage of responses reported as "unsure," there is little known about the nature of unsure responses, and nonresponse error could be a concern. For example, approximately one out of every ten (11.8%) respondents reported "unsure" when asked to what degree they trusted local government, and there was not an opportunity to dig in deeper to understand the meaning of uncertainty with regards to a lack of trust in local government. However, regression analyses revealed no significant differences between the groups of responders and non-responders in instances where the number of responses for the criterion variable was low.

Suggestions for Future Research

Recognizing the importance of the relationship between neighborhood revitalization planning, resident engagement and social capital, and the impact of those relationships on residents' readiness for the transformation, future research should continue to examine the application of these concepts in the pursuit and promotion of a thriving civic economy. It is recommended that future research should examine the impacts of civic engagement and collaboration on community mobilization and action, investigate the specific types of social

capital to identify and isolate which most aid in fostering healthy communities, and identify best practices for how social capital can be built, including strategies for measuring and recommendations for facilitating meaningful community engagement.

Collaboration and civic engagement proved to be important constructs related to gains in social capital. Future research should examine within neighborhood collaboration as well as collaboration involving residents and key influencers among cross-sector partners. Examining community collaboration frameworks such as collective impact, and the types and degrees of resident involvement in community change efforts would provide relevant and timely knowledge for community development policymakers and practitioners to aid in the selection of strategies for building effective partnerships. If residents working with others within their community might enhance social capital at the individual level, more should be understood about how large-scale collaboration can mobilize and benefit neighborhood residents and cultivate collective efficacy and social capital.

Social capital should be studied at not only the neighborhood level, but in the larger context of a community planning effort, including all groups of stakeholders and residents. The literature describes many types of social capital, including bonding, bridging, strong ties, weak ties, which categorize social capital within groups and communities, across groups and communities, and according to the degree of closeness those ties imply. Weak social ties have been described as episodic and fleeting (Sander & Lowney, 2004), yet can open doors to economic mobility by increasing access to opportunities, for example with jobs and housing (Green & Haines, 2015). If housing policy and revitalization initiatives are concerned with de-concentrating poverty, economic mobility, and building healthy communities, then the value of facilitating weak bonding and bridging social capital ties among neighborhood residents, and

with and across community stakeholders warrants a more in-depth examination. Additionally, various types of social capital could be examined to understand what leads most readily to the articulation of collective goals and social action – for example, whether the network density of weak or strong ties and bonding or bridging capital are indicative of community readiness and mobilization. A narrower understanding of the utility of the various types and dimensions of social capital and their potential influence over readiness and mobilization could inform the development of social capital building strategies and best practices in community development.

A final recommendation is for scholars to seek a deeper understanding of what constitutes meaningful community engagement, and what specific types of engagement activities lead to actionable community improvements. Understanding the quality of engagement – not merely the behavior or instance of it – could lead to the creation of a roadmap of 'what works' for community development planners, practitioners and community organizers. Identifying specific methods to better describe, operationalize and measure meaningful community engagement would allow communities to focus their energies on proven engagement strategies that effectively build community capitals and the civic economy.

Implications for Practice and Policy

Social work is concerned with social justice, empowerment, and improving conditions for people living in impoverished communities. Many social workers practice in the field of community development, as organizers, planners, policymakers, advocates and administrators, and community-level interventionists. The findings of this study in the context with previous research offer several recommendations for social workers and community development professionals, including directions for community planning, community organizing and sustainable community change.

First, the important role that homeowners might play in neighborhood planning, mobilization, and readiness for change should be considered. Homeowners may view themselves as having more invested in their communities, and may tend to be more actively engaged in civic activities; therefore, they may be more inclined to participate actively in community planning processes. Homeowners may be the initial step to gaining access to and building relationships in a community. Trust is necessary feature of community building and is at the core of social capital, but little is known about how trust is formed and the uncertainties surrounding trust in low-wealth communities. Relationships are the instruments for the formation of trust, and relationships with homeowners may be more readily developed in communities of concentrated disadvantage.

Next, targeted strategies to reach, mobilize and engage renters in low-wealth communities are important, as this population in general may trust less, may be less engaged, and may be more transient when compared with neighborhood homeowners. Renters may feel somewhat less connected to and invested in the larger community, and if they live in a multi-family housing complex, may identify the housing community itself as their 'neighborhood' and not view themselves as part of the larger geographic area. Renters may have more intensely experienced the impact of structural inequalities than homeowners. Residential, institutional and structural inequalities have contributed to the deterioration of trust in disadvantaged communities. Economic exploitation of people in impoverished communities, by slumlords and payday lenders, for example, has contributed to the erosion of trust. In consideration of the potential for social class stratification in low wealth neighborhoods, renters may most intensely experience the adverse impacts of residential instability and structural inequities. Specific strategies to develop leadership and build networks with renters will need to be devised.

Community development practitioners and community organizers should be cautious to not make promises that cannot be kept, as residents in low-income communities are weary of failed commitments from outsiders and institutions, and this leads to mistrust, which ultimately leads to more harm than good. Community development practitioners and community organizers must practice sensitively and with patience, as trust takes time to develop and to be repaired. Trust is built through relationships, and relationships within communities and with residents and outside stakeholders will be important to continue to develop at the local community level to build trust, and ultimately facilitate overall community health.

Additionally, this study found that an unexpectedly high number of residents believed they possessed the ability to improve or make decisions that impact their neighborhood. This leads to the question of – why, if so many believe they have the ability to improve their community – is not more being done? It may be that there exists a large degree of untapped potential in low-wealth communities. It may be that people need to feel empowered to take action, to be given capacity building opportunities to learn how to address community concerns, and to rediscover hope that change is truly possible in order to find motivation to employ their human capital in a collective effort for community progress. Previous studies have shown that perceived powerlessness is related to experiences of diminished social trust (Alesina & Ferrera, 2002; Ross et al., 2001).

Empowerment has been defined as the "process of increasing personal, interpersonal, or political power so that individuals, families, and communities can take action to improve their situations" (Gutierrez, 1995, p. 229). Steps to reaching a *critical consciousness* of empowerment involve (a) group identification – sharing a common concern with other community members; (b) group consciousness – awareness of the dynamics and structure of power within a

community; and (c) collective efficacy – belief in one's ability to impact social change (Gurin, Miller & Gurin, 1980; Gutierrez, 1995). Critical consciousness begins by recognizing powerlessness as a contributor to community issues (Gutierrez, 1995). Residents in concentrated disadvantage may not recognize they lack the power to influence decisions and the structure of power dynamics impacting their community in order to make improvements in their own community. It may be that many residents perceived they were empowered, but in fact possessed no real power. The ability to exercise influence and negotiate power is likely an uncommon experience for many residents living in concentrated disadvantage. Residents in low-wealth communities might be accustomed to 'participation' in community affairs at the lower rungs of Arstein's (1969) ladder, and may perceive that being informed, consulted with, or placated is the equivalency of exercising their power. Partnership and delegated power, much-less citizen control, may be such foreign concepts they are not recognized as potentially achievable roles.

From the focus group dialogue in this study, it is clear that many residents desire to be a partner in the process of decision-making about their own communities. Community development practitioners would benefit by recognizing the enormous value that a resident-driven approach lends to the community change process; after all, residents are the true experts on matters in their own community. Enlisting residents as equal partners at the table guiding and informing decisions about the future direction of the neighborhood is the path to building both people and the community up in a positive direction, toward a thriving civic economy and a healthy, sustainable community.

The implications for housing policy from this study reinforce the emphasis on meaningful resident engagement in holistic neighborhood transformation initiatives, such as HUD's Choice Neighborhoods. Residents want to be engaged, and to be an equal partner with decision-making

ability in the process – from planning through implementation. This study considered social capital in one neighborhood that was the target of a Choice Neighborhood planning initiative. More research should be conducted to understand social capital, readiness for transformation, and resident engagement across multiple Choice Neighborhood sites to identify best practices to inform future policy decisions. Community-engagement should continue to be included as a formalized expectation of future affordable housing and neighborhood policies. However, community-engagement is a loosely defined term, and subject to the interpretation of local leadership. It is recommended that standards for authentic engagement are established in future program policies, and that these standards are established with meaningful input from residents in low-wealth neighborhoods that are targeted for place-based transformation. Additionally, as suggested in research recommendations, formalized measures for meaningful resident engagement should be derived in order to assist local leadership in evaluating the process and impact of engagement activities. Including residents in decision-making about establishing standards for policy and programming regarding authentic resident engagement, and in the development of instrumentation to evaluate the practice of resident engagement are important steps that would model meaningful community engagement practice in community development.

Summary and Conclusions

Although the overall sample size of this study was small, this study was an effort to move one step closer to understanding the social capital perceptions and experiences of residents in low-wealth communities. The community in this study is not unlike many other high-stress neighborhoods in urban areas experiencing concentrated disadvantage, particularly in the southern US, and further understanding the roles that homeownership, civic engagement,

collaboration, trust and social capital play in promoting community health may be helpful for researchers, policymakers and practitioners.

One important aspect of this study was the community-engaged research process, and it is important to emphasize the meaningful contribution that residents and community partners can lend to the process for neighborhood-level research. The perspectives and the experiences of the residents in this community of interest drove the framing and execution of this study. From the design of the survey approach, to the development of the survey instrument, to the administration of the survey, the process of this community-engaged study reflected the core values associated with community empowerment initiatives. Though research rigor may be compromised through a collaborative approach such as utilized in this study, the potential to build local capacity, to build academic-community trust, to promote culturally responsive research practice, and to provide outcomes of research that are meaningful to participants are important consideration in community research and development.

This research supports previous studies that found higher levels of civic engagement in homeowners than in renters (DiPasquale & Glaeser, 1999; Manturuk et al., 2009). This research suggests that homeowners may feel more connected to their neighborhood than renters, may be more committed to remaining in the neighborhood for the long term, and therefore may be more inclined to be actively involved in revitalization planning efforts. Homeowners could be important drivers of neighborhood-level change. Further, this research uncovered a distinct connection between homeownership and empowerment, belief in one's ability to contribute to and impact their neighborhood.

As homeownership was associated with higher household-level income and higher educational attainment, it is possible to consider homeownership as an indicator of economic

prosperity. This research suggests there could be relative social class effects in low wealth communities that should be further examined, whereas people with the fewest resources may be more likely to experience a sense of institutional disengagement, and a higher degree of powerlessness. Therefore, engagement of the disengaged remains a major challenge. The significance of social class effects, structural inequality, and community empowerment should be further investigated with regard to varying experiences of trust, civic engagement, collaboration and social capital among homeowners and non-homeowners.

People influence the environments in which they live, and environments influence the people that live within them. Social ecological theory allows for the understanding of the complexities of a person in their environment, and the many systems that influence life opportunities and health outcomes. Residents engaged in civic activities may be more likely to have hope for the future of their neighborhood, and conversely, residents who are more optimistic about the future of their neighborhood may be more inclined to become engaged in civic and political community activities. In community research, it is important to note that both individual proclivities and environmental attributes and influences play important roles in shaping the civic economy. Is hope a personal characteristic, or a facet of the civic climate of the community? To be sure, what accounts for a person's sense of civic commitment is personal, and reflects certain personality elements. But equally true is that people are impacted by the social ecology in the acquisition of a sense of hope and inclination to become involved in community affairs.

Trust was not found to be as relevant to openness to transformation, and gains in neither civic engagement nor collaboration across the year-long study were associated with gains in trust. However, trust was a critical theme in the focus group findings. In this study few residents

had a lot of trust, more had some, and most had a little or none at all. Previous research has found that social capital has a positive impact on neighborhood stability (Temkin & Rohe, 1998). As trust is considered to be at the core of social capital, and social capital takes time to build, it remains necessary to work to identify the most effective ways to build social capital and trust. Economic mobility is achieved through social leverage, those relationships that are built on trust that help people to 'get ahead' in life (Briggs, 1998). If social capital is a resource to be accessed, and leveraging social capital is important to economic mobility, then communities need processes to break down social isolation, as socially isolated communities have diminished access to social capital leveraging resources (Briggs, 1998).

Collaboration and civic engagement are critical building blocks of social capital and community transformation. Collaboration builds and strengthens relationships, relationships build trust, and increases in relationships and trust are indicative of increases in social capital. As social capital is built at the community level, collective capital can lead to collective action and social change. It is important to continue to improve processes to foster collaborative conditions and strategies to facilitate engagement in community change efforts to build healthy communities. A thriving civic economy is best achieved through a meaningful, resident-driven planning process that focuses on collaboration and authentic engagement, building on the strengths of the community, and investing in the people where they live.

REFERENCES

Abramovitz, M. (1993). Social work and social reform: An arena of struggle. *Social Work, 43*(6), 512-526.

Adler, P., & Kwon, S. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *The Academy of Management Review, 27*(1), 17-40.

Ahsan, N. (2008). *Sustaining neighborhood change: The power of resident leadership, social networks, and community mobilization*. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Aiyer, S. M., Zimmerman, M. A., Morrel-Samuels, S., & Reischl, T. M. (2015). From broken windows to busy streets: A community empowerment perspective. *Health Education & Behavior, 42*(2) 137-147.

Alesina, A., & Ferrara, E. L. (2002). Who trusts others? *Journal of Public Economics, 85*, 207-234.

Alinsky, S. (1941). Community analysis and organization. *American Journal of Sociology, 46*(6), 797-808.

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A pragmatic primer for realistic radicals*. New York, NY: Random House.

Anderson-Butcher, D., Iachinin, A., Ball, A., Barker, S., & Martin, L. (2015). A university-school partnership to examine the adoption and implementation of the Ohio Community Collaboration Model in one urban school district: A mixed method case study. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*. Manuscript in press for publication.

Andranovich, G. & Howell, R. E. (1995). The community survey: A tool for participation and factfinding. *Community Ventures: Partnerships in Education and Research*. Pullman, WA: Cooperative Extensive, Washington State University.

Andrews, N. O., & Retsinas, N. P. (2012). Inflection point: New vision, new strategy, new organization. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 407-1419). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2003). *Resident engagement and leadership to improve results for children and youth, families and communities*. Retrieved from http://www.aecf.org/resources/resident-engagement-and-leadership-to-improve-results-for-children-and-yout/

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2013). *Community change: Lessons from making connections.* Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2015). *Rebuilding communities initiative*. Retrieved from: http://www.aecf.org/work/past-work/rebuilding-communities-initiative/

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35*(4), 216-224.

Austin, M., Coombs, M., & Barr, B. (2005). Community-centered clinical practice: Is the integration of micro and macro social work practice possible?. *Journal of Community Practice, 13*(4), 9-30.

Bakker, L., & Dekker, K. (2012). Social trust in urban neighbourhoods: The effect of relative ethnic group position. *Urban Studies, 49*(10), 2031-2047.

Banks, S., & Butcher, H. (2013). What is community practice? In S. Banks, H. Butcher, A. Orton & J. Robertson (Eds.), *Managing community practice: Principles, policies and programmes* (2nd ed). Chicago, IL: The Policy Press.

Beck, E. L., & Eichler, M. (2000). Consensus organizing: A practice model for community building. *Journal of Community Practice, 8*(1), 87-102.

Beehler, S. (2011). Advancing the science of community-level interventions. *American Journal of Public Health, 101*(8), 1410-1419.

Belsky, E., & Fauth, J. (2012). Crossing over to an improved era of community development. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 72-103). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Berry, M. E. (1986). *The settlement house movement 1886-1986: One hundred years on urban frontiers*. Washington, DC: United Neighborhood Centers of America.

Berube, A. (2012). The continuing evolution of American poverty and its implications for community development. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 55-71). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Bishaw, A. (2014). Changes in areas with concentrated poverty: 2000 to 2010. *American Community Survey Reports*. Washington, DC: US Census.

Bisman, C. (2004). Social work values: The moral core of the profession. *British Journal of Social Work, 34*(1), 109-123.

Blackwell, A. G. (2012). America's tomorrow: Race, place, and the equity agenda. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 133-139). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Blanchard, A. (2012). People transforming communities. For good. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 140-149). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Bolland, J., & McCallum, D. (2002). Neighboring and community mobilization in high-poverty inner-city neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review, 38*(1), 42-69.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Briggs, X. (1997). Social capital and the cities: Advice to change agents. *National Civic Review, 86(*2), 111-118.

Briggs, X. (1998). Brown kids in white suburbs: Housing mobility and the many faces of social capital. *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(1), 177-213.

Brisson, D., & Usher, C. L. (2007). Conceptualizing and measuring bonding social capital in low income neighborhoods. *Journal of Social Service Research, 34*(1), 1-11.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22*(6), 723-742.

Brophy, P. C., & Smith, R. N. (1997). Mixed-income housing: Factors for success. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research, 3*(2), 3-31.

Brown, M. E. (2011). *Allendale/Ledbetter Heights Choice Neighborhood planning grant*. Proposal funded by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Brueggemann, W. (2014). *The practice of macro social work* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *Occupational outlook handbook.* Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos060.htm

Campbell, D. (2006). What is education's impact on civic and social engagement? *Measuring the effects of education on health and civic engagement: Proceedings of the Copenhagen symposium.* Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/edu/innovation-education/37425694.pdf

Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Building community capacity: A definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review, 36*(3), 291-323.

Chaskin, R. J., Chipenda-Dansokho, S., Joseph, M., & Richards, C. (2001). *An evaluation of the Ford Foundation's neighborhood and family initiative*. Retrieved from: http://www.chapinhall.org/research/report/evaluation-ford-foundations-neighborhood-and-family-initiative

City of Shreveport. (2013). *Shreveport choice neighborhood transformation plan*. Shreveport, LA: City of Shreveport.

Cnaan, R. A., Boddie, S. C., Yancey, G. I. (2005). Rise up and build the cities: Faith-based community organizing. In M. Weil (Ed.), *The Handbook of Community Practice* (pp. 372-386). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cnaan, R. A., & Rothman, J. (2008). Capacity development and the building of community. In J. Rothman, J.L. Erlich, & J.E. Tropman (Eds.) *Strategies of Community Intervention* 7th ed. (pp. 243-262). Peosta, IA: Eddie Bowers.

Coleman, J. (1998). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94*, S95-S120.

Conway, A. M., & Murphy, L. (2012). *Compendium for the civic economy: What our cities, towns, and neighborhoods should learn from 25 trailblazers*. London: Trancity Valiz.

Cox, F., Erlich, J., Rothman, J., & Tropman, J. (1974). *Strategies of community organization: A book of readings* (2nd ed.). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock.

Cramm, J. M., van Dijk, H. M., & Nieboer, A. P. (2013). The importance of neighborhood social cohesion and social capital for the well being of older adults in the community. *Gerontologist, 53*(1), 142-152.

Crane, D. R., & Heaton, T. B. (2008). Introduction. In D. Crane & T. Heaton (Eds.) *Handbook of families and poverty*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crean, P., & Baskerville, M. A. (2007). Community advocacy- a social work role? *Social Work Review, 19*(4), 3-10.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curley, A. M. (2005). Theories of urban poverty and implications for public housing policy. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *32*(2), 97-119.

Dale, O., Smith, R., Norlin, J., & Chess, W. (2006). *Human behavior and the social environment: Social systems theory*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Darling, N. (2007). Ecological systems theory: The person in the center of the circles. *Research in Human Development, 4*(3-4), 203-217.

Davis, S. (1988). “Soft” versus “hard” social work. *Social Work, 33*(4), 373-374.

Dean, H. (1992). Poverty discourse and the disempowerment of the poor. *Critical Social Policy, 12(*2), 79-88.

Dean, W. (1977). Back to activism. *Social Work, 22*(5), 369-373.

Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2003). Who trusts? The origins of social trust in seven societies. *European Societies, 5*(2), 93-137.

DeNavas-Walt, C., & Proctor, B. D. (2014). *Income and poverty in the Unites States: 2013 current population reports*. Report produced by the US Department of Commerce. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications /2014/demo/p60-249.pdf

Dhillon, J. K. (2009). The role of social capital in sustaining partnership. *British Educational Research Journal, 35*(5), 687-704.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

DiPasquale, D., & Glaeser, E. (1999). Incentives and social capital: Are homeowners better citizens? *Journal of Urban Economics, 45*(2), 354-384.

Donovan, S., Duncan, A., & Sebelius. K. (2012). Fighting poverty through community development. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America’s Communities* (pp. 107-131). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Dreier, P. (1996). Community empowerment strategies: The limits and potential of community organizing in urban neighborhoods. *Cityscape, 2*(2), 121-159.

DuBois, B. L., & Miley, K. K. (2005). *Social work: An empowering profession* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative. (2015). DSNI historic timeline. Retrieved from: http://www.dsni.org/dsni-historic-timeline/

Edelman, P. (2012). Our history with concentrated poverty. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America’s Communities* (pp. 309-320). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Edwards, L. M. (2009). Ideational social capital and the civic culture: Extricating Putnam's legacy from the social capital debates. *Social Epistemology*, *23*(2), 125-144.

Ehrenreich, J. (1985). *The altruistic imagination: A history of social work and social policy in the United States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Eichler, M. (2007). *Consensus organizing: Building communities of mutual self-interest*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Emery, M., & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling up: Mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *Community Development, 37*(1), 19-35.

Erickson, D. (2009). *The housing policy revolution: Networks and neighbors*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Erickson, D., Galloway, I., & Cytron, N. (2012). Routinizing the extraordinary. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 377-406). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Flanagan, R. M. (1997). The housing act of 1954: The sea change in national urban policy. *Urban Affairs Review, 33*, 265-286.

Flexner, A. (2001). Is social work a profession? *Research on Social Work Practice, 2001, 11*(2), 152-165. (Original work published 1915)

Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies, 38*(12), 2125-2143.

Franklin, S., & Edwards, D. (2012). It takes a neighborhood: Purpose built communities and neighborhood transformation. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 170-183). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Franzini, L. (2008). Predictors of trust in low-income, minority neighborhoods in Texas. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 19*(4), 1282-1302.

Fudge, K. (2011). Choice neighborhoods: History and HOPE. *Evidence Matters*, Winter Issue, 1-7.

Geller, J. D., Doykos, B., Craven, K., Bess, K. D., & Nation, M. (2014). Engaging residents in community change: The critical role of trust in the development of a promise neighborhood. *Teachers College Record, 116*(4), 1-42.

Gennetian, L. A., Ludwig, J., McDade, T., & Sanbonmatsu, L. (2013). Why concentrated poverty matters. *Pathways: A Magazine on Poverty, Inequality, & Social Policy*, Spring 2013, 9-13.

Gittell, R., & Vidal, A. (1998). *Community organizing: Building social capital as a development strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D., Scheinkman, J., & Soutter, C. (2000). Measuring trust. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115*(3), 811-846.

Glaeser, E. L., & Redlick, C. (2009). Social capital and urban growth. *International Regional Science Review, 32*(3), 264-299.

Goodman, L. (1961). Snowball sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 32*(1), 148-170.

Green, G. P., & Haines, A. (2015). *Asset building and community development* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Sage.

Greenbaum, S., Hathaway, W., Rodriguez, C., Spalding, A., & Ward, B. (2008). Deconcentration and social capital: Contradictions of a poverty alleviation policy. *Journal of Poverty*, *12*(2), 201-228.

Greene, R. (2005). Redefining social work for the new millennium: Setting a context. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *11*(1), 37-54.

Gurin, P, Miller, A., & Gurin, G. (1980). Statum identification and consciousness. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 43*, 30-47.

Gutierrez, L. (1995). Understanding the empowerment process: Does consciousness make a difference? *Social Work Research, 19*(4), 229-237.

Halpern, R. (1995). *Rebuilding the inner city: A history of neighborhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Hansan, J. E. (2013). *Charity organization societies (1877-1893).* Retrieved from: http://www.socialwelfarehistory.com/?p=8401

Hardcastle, D., Wenocur, S., & Powers, P. (1997). *Community practice: Theories and skills for social workers*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and trustworthiness*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Harpham, T. (2008). The measurement of community social capital through surveys. In I. Kawachi, S.V. Subramanian, & D. Kim (Eds.), *Social capital and health* (pp. 51-62). New York, NY: Springer.

Harpham, T., Grant, E., & Thomas, E. (2002). Measuring social capital within health surveys: Key issues. *Health Policy & Planning, 17*(1), 106-111.

Hays, R. A. (1995). *The federal government and urban housing: Ideology and change in public policy* (2nd ed.) Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hecht, B. (2012). From community to prosperity. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 192-203). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Helliwell, J. F., & Putnam, R. (1999). *Education and social capital*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series.

Helliwell J. F., & Putnam, R. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Biological Sciences, 359*(1449), 1435-1446.

Hillman, A., & Seever, F. (1968). *Making democracy work: A study of neighborhood organization*. New York, NY: National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers.

Hoefer, R. (2000). Human services interest groups in four states: Lessons for effective advocacy. *Journal of Community Practice, 7*(4), 77-94.

Huff, D. (2002). *The social work history station*. Retrieved from http://www.boisestate.edu/socwork/dhuff/XX.htm

Hurlbert, J. S., Beggs, J. J., & Haines, V. A. (2008). Social networks and social capital in extreme environments. In N. Lin, K. Cook & R. S. Burt (Eds.), *Social Capital Theory and Research* (pp. 209-232). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Original work published 2001)

Hutchinson, E. (2003). *Dimensions of human behavior: Person and environment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hyman, J. B. (2002). Exploring social capital and civic engagement to create a framework for community building. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 196-202.

Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center. (n.d.). *Organizer's workbook: Moving your neighborhood from good to great*. Retrieved from http://www.planning.ri.gov/documents/comp/OrganizerWorkbook.pdf

Jackson, J. S., & Neighbors, H. W. (1997). *National survey of black Americans, Wave 1-4*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Joseph, M. L., Chaskin, R. J., & Webber, H. S. (2007). The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review, 42*(3), 369-409.

Kahn, S. (2001). Political race, faith, and the democratic process: Keep your eyes on the prize. *New York University Review of Law & Social Change, 27*(1), 89-100.

Karpman, M. (2014). Resident engagement facilitates neighborhood revitalization in small cities. *National League of Cities*. Retrieved from: http://www.nlc.org/media-center/news-search/resident-engagement-facilitates-neighborhood-revitalization-in-small-cities

Katz, M. B. (2013). *The undeserving poor: America's enduring confrontation with poverty (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Keels, M. (2008). Residential attainment of now-adult Gautreaux children: Do they gain, hold or lose ground in neighborhood ethnic and economic segregation?. *Housing Studies*, 23(4), 541-564.

Kim, D., & Kawachi, I. (2006). A multilevel analysis of key forms of community- and individual-level social capital as predictors of self-rated health in the United States. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*(5), 813-826.

Kingsley, G., McNeely, J., & Gibson, J. (1997). *Community-building: Coming of age*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Knack, S., & Keefer, P. (1997). Does social capital have an economic payoff? A cross-country investigation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112*(4), 1251-1288.

Kneebone, E., Nadeau, C., & Berube, A. (2011). The re-emergence of concentrated poverty: Metropolitan trends in the 2000s. *Metropolitan Opportunity Series,* Brookings Institute.

Kraus, N. (2004). Local policymaking and concentrated poverty: The case of Buffalo, New York. *Cities, 21*(6), 481-490.

Land, H. (1987). The effects of licensure on student motivation and career choice. *Social Work, 32*(1), 75-77.

Larsen, K. (2002). Harmonious inequality? Zoning, public housing, and Orlando's separate city, 1920-1945. *Journal of Planning History, 1*(2), 154-180.

Lavizzo-Mourey, R. (2012). Why health, poverty, and community development are inseparable. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 215-225). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Leigh, A. (2006). Trust, inequality and ethnic heterogeneity. *Economic Record, 82*(258), 268-280.

Lesser, J., & Pope, D. (2007). *Human behavior and the social environment: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(2), 309-337.

Lewin, K. (1931). Environmental forces in child behavior and development. In C. Murchison (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 94-127). Worcester, Mass: Clark University Press.

Lin, N. (2008). A network theory of social capital. In D. Castiglione, J. W. van Deth, & G. Wolleb (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Capital* (pp. 50-59). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lin, N., Cook, K., & Burt, R. (2008). *Social capital: Theory and research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (Original work published 2001)

Lochner, K., Kawachi, I., & Kennedy, B. P. (1999). Social capital: A guide to its measurement. *Health & Place, 5*(4), 259-270.

Manturuk, K., Lindblad, M., & Quercia, R. (2009). Homeownership and local voting in disadvantaged urban neighborhoods. *Cityscape, 11*(3), 213-230.

Marschall, M. J., & Stolle, D. (2004). Race and the city: Neighborhood context and the development of generalized trust. *Political Behavior, 26*(2), 125-153.

Marx, J. D. (2011). Women, settlements, and the redefinition of poverty. The Social Welfare History Project. Retrieved from http://www.socialwelfarehistory.com/eras/women-settlements-and-poverty/

McCabe, B. (2012). Homeownership and social trust in neighbors. *City & Community, 11*(4), 389-408.

Mendenhall, R., DeLuca, S., & Duncan, G. (2006). Neighborhood resources, racial segregation, and economic mobility: Results from the Gautreaux program. *Social Science Research*, *35*(4), 892-923.

Messner, S. F., Baumer, E. P., & Rosenfeld, R. (2004). Dimensions of social capital and rates of criminal homicide. *American Sociological Review, 69*, 882-903.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review 3*, 672-682.

Midgley, J., & Livermore, M. (1998). Social capital and local economic development: Implications for community social work practice. *Journal of Community Practice, 5*(1-2), 29-40.

Midgley, J., & Livermore, M. (2005). Development theory and community practice. In M. Weil (Ed.), *The Handbook of Community Practice* (pp. 153-168). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, C. (2012). The world has changed and so must we. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 226-236). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Mitchell, K. (2007). *AllendaleONE: Part of the "total" commitment neighborhood initiative*. Shreveport, LA: MHSM Architects.

Morrison, E. (2011). Strategic doing for community development. In N. Walzer & G. F. Hamm (Eds.), *Community Visioning Programs* (pp. 156-177). New York, NY: Routledge.

Morrison, E. (2013). Universities as anchors for regional innovation ecosystems. *Ed Morrison's Garage*. Retrieved from http://www.edmorrison.com/universities-as-anchors-for-regional-innovation-ecosystems/

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mouw, T. (2002). Are black workers missing the connection? The effect of spatial distance and employee referrals on interfirm racial segregation. *Demography, 39*(3), 507-528.

National Association of Social Workers. (2008). *NASW Code of ethics: Guide to the everyday professional conduct of social workers.* Washington, DC: NASW.

National Low Income Housing Coalition. (2011). *Advocates praise one-for-one replacement requirements in latest Choice Neighborhoods Initiative award*. Retrieved from http://nlihc.org/press/releases/9-7-11

National People's Action. (2015). *About us*. Retrieved from: http://npa-us.org/about-us

Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments. (2012). *Shreveport choice neighborhoods*. Retrieved from http://shreveportchoiceneighborhoods.com/

Ochoa, N. (2004). Social workers and the working and middle classes. *Social Work*, *49*(3), 517-519.

O'Donnell, S. M. (1996). Urban African American community development in the progressive era. *Journal of Community Practice, 2*(4), 7-26.

O'Hara, S. U. (2001). Urban development revisited: The role of neighborhood needs and local participation in urban revitalization. *Review of Social Economy, 59*(1), 23-43.

Ohmer, M., & DeMasi, K. (2009). *Consensus organizing: A community development workbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parsons, T. (1950). The prospects of sociological theory. *American Sociological Review, 15*(1), 3-16.

Pawel, M. (2014). Seeds are sown: The crusades of Cesar Chavez. *Social Policy, 44*(2), 49-55.

Perlman, R., & Gurin, A. (1972). *Community organization and social planning*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Pilisuk, M., McAllister, J., & Rothman, J. (1996). Coming together for action: The challenge of contemporary grassroots community organizing. *Journal of Social Issues, 52*(1), 15-37.

Pinsky, M. A. (2012). What problem are we trying to solve?. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 246-254). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Pinsoneault, L., & Van Hoorn, M. (2013). *Cultivate, engage, and inspire residents: Recipes for rising neighborhoods*. Retrieved from http://www.alliance1.org/ce/form/download-free-copy-recipes-rising-neighborhoods

Plater, Z. J. B. (1999). Environmental law and three economies: Navigating a sprawling field of study, practice and societal governance in which everything is connected to everything else. *Harvard Environmental Law Review, 23*, 359-392.

Popkin, S. (2002). *The HOPE VI program – what about the residents*? Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Popkin, S. J., Cunningham, M. K., & Burt, M. (2005). Public housing transformation and the hard to house. *Housing Policy Debate, 16*(1), 1-24.

Popkin, S. J., Katz, B., Cunningham, M. K., Brown, K. D., Gustafson, J., & Turner, M. A. (2004). *A decade of HOPE VI: Research findings and policy challenges.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

Portes, A. (2000). The two meanings of social capital. *Sociological Forum, 15*(1), 1-12.

Price, H. (2011). A seat at the table: Place-based urban policy and community engagement. *Harvard Journal of African American Policy*. Retrieved from http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k74757&pageid=icb.page414112&pageContentId=icb.pagecontent868240&state=maximize

Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. (2000a). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. (2000b). *The social capital community benchmark, Saguaro seminar: Civic engagement in America*. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/communitysurvey/docs/survey_instrument.pdf

Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research, 2*(1), 41-51.

Putnam, R. (2002a). *Democracies in flux: The evolution of social capital in contemporary society*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Putnam, R. (2002b). *Social capital community benchmark survey: Short form*. Retrieved from http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/socialcapitalshortform.pdf

Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the Twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte prize lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(2), 137-174.

Pyles, L. (2009). *Progressive community organizing: A critical approach for a globalizing world*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pyles, L., & Cross, T. (2008). Community revitalization in post-Katrina New Orleans: A critical analysis of social capital in an African American neighborhood. *Journal of Community Practice, 16*(4), 383-401.

Reim, M. C. (2013). *Rebuilding social capital through community institutions*. The Center for Policy Innovation. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

Reisch, M. (2005). Community practice challenges in the global economy. In M. Weil (Ed.), *The Handbook of Community Practice* (pp. 529-547). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rich, R.C., Edlestein, M., Hallman, W.K., & Wandersman, A.H. (1995). Citizen participation and empowerment: The case of local environmental hazards. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*(5), 657-676.

Ritter, J. (2007). Evaluating the political participation of licensed social workers in the new millennium. *Journal of Policy Practice, 6*(4), 61-78.

Ross, C. E., Mirowsky, J., & Pribesh, S. (2001). Powerlessness and the amplification of threat: Neighborhood disadvantage, disorder, and mistrust. *American Sociological Review, 66*(4), 568-591.

Rothman, J. (1999). *Reflections on community organization: Enduring themes and critical issues*. Cengage Learning.

Rothman, J. (2008). Multi modes of community intervention. In J. Rothman, J. Erlich, & J. Tropman (Eds.) *Strategies of community intervention* (7th ed.). Peosta, IA: Eddie Bowers.

Rothman, J., Erlich, J., & Tropman, J. (2001). *Strategies of community intervention* (6th ed.). Peosta, IA: Eddie Bowers.

Rothstein, R. (2015). The racial achievement gap, segregated schools, and segregated neighborhoods: A constitutional insult. *Race and Social Problems, 7*(1), 21-30.

Rotolo, T., Wilson, J., & Hughes, M. (2010). Homeownership and volunteering: An alternative approach to studying social inequality and civic engagement. *Sociological Forum, 25*(3), 570-587.

Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist, 35*(1), 1-7.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2008). *Research methods for social work* (6th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey: Leading professionals give you proven techniques for getting reliable results*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sampson, R. J. (2009). Racial stratification and the durable tangle of neighborhood inequality. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 62*(1), 260-280.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new direction in research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*, 443-478.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918-924.

Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S.W. (1999). Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology, 105*(3), 630-651.

Sander, T. H., & Lowney, K. (2006). *Social capital building toolkit (version 1.2).* Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/saguaro/pdfs/skbuildingtoolkitversion1.2.pdf

Scanlon, E., Hartnett, H., & Harding, S. (2006). An analysis of the political activities of NASW state chapters. *Journal of Policy Practice, 5*(4), 41-54.

Schill, M. (1997). Assessing the role of community development corporations in inner city economic development. *New York University Review of Law and Social Change*, 753-781.

Schneider, R., & Netting, E. (1999). Influencing social policy in a time of devolution: Upholding social work's great tradition. *Social Work, 44*(4), 349-357.

Schriver, J. (2004). *Human behavior and the social environment: Shifting paradigms in essential knowledge for social work practice* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Schultz, A., & Sandy, M. G. (2011). *Collective action for social change: An introduction to community organizing*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schwadel, P., & Stout, M. (2012). Age, period and cohort effects on social capital. *Social Forces, 91*(1), 233-252.

Schwartz, A. F. (2010). *Housing policy in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Seidman, E. (2012). Integration and innovation in a time of stress: Doing the best for people and place. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 354-376). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Siporin, M. (1980). Ecological systems theory in social work. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 7*(4), 507-532.

Small, M., & Newman, K. (2001). Urban poverty after The Truly Disadvantaged: The rediscovery of the family, the neighborhood, and culture. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 23-45.

Smith, S. S. (2010). Race and trust. *Annual Review of Sociology, 36*, 453-475.

Sosin, M., & Caulum, S. (1983). Advocacy: A conceptualization for social work and practice. *Social Work, 28*(1), 12-17.

Specht, H., & Courtney, M. (1994). *How social work has abandoned its mission: Unfaithful angels*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Steen, J. (2006). The roots of human rights advocacy and a call to action. *Social Work, 51*(2), 101-105.

Stevens, A. (1999). Climbing out of poverty, falling back in. *Journal of Human Resources, 34*(3), 557-588.

Stolle, D. (2002). Trusting strangers – the concept of generalized trust in perspective. *Österreichische Zeitschrift Für Politikwissenschaft, 31*(4), 397-412.

Subramaniam, S. V., Kim, D. J., & Kawachi, I. (2002). Social trust and self-rated health in US communities: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Urban Health, 79*(4), S21-S34.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tavernise, S. (2011, September 13). Soaring poverty casts spotlight on 'lost decade'. *The New York Times*, pp. 1A. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/14/us/14census.html?_r=1&ref=us

Taylor, E. (1995). The Dudley street neighborhood initiative and the power of eminent domain. *Boston College Law Review, 36*(5), 1061-1088.

Taylor, P., Funk, C., & Clark, A. (2007). Americans and social trust: Who, where and why. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/10/SocialTrust.pdf

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioral sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Temkin, K., & Rohe, W. M. (1998). Social capital and neighborhood stability: An empirical investigation. *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(1), 61-88.

Thomspons, J. (2011). Building the civic economy. *RSA Journal, 157*(5546), 32-33.

Tough, P. (2008). *Whatever it takes: Geoffrey Canada's quest to change Harlem and America*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Trattner, W. (1999). *From poor law to welfare state: A history of social welfare in America*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Trent, T. R., & Chavis, D. M. (2009). Scope, scale, and sustainability: What it takes to create lasting community change. *The Foundation Review, 1*(1), 96-114.

Turner, M. A. (2010). New life for US housing and urban policy. *City & Community, 9*(1), 32-38.

Turner, M. A., Woolley, M., Kingsley, G. T., Popkin, S. J., Levy, D., & Cove, E. (2007). *Estimating the public costs and benefits of HOPE VI investments: Methodological report.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.

US Census Bureau. (2013). *American community survey 5-year estimates. Census tracts 201, 204, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 219*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml

US Census Bureau. (2014a). *About poverty: 2013 highlights*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/about/overview/

US Census Bureau. (2014b). Poverty: Definitions. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/methods/definitions.html

US Department of Agriculture. (2015). *Food access research atlas*. Retrieved from: http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas/go-to-the-atlas.aspx

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1995). *HUD reinvention: From blueprint to action*. Washington, DC: US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Retrieved from http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=pur1.32754066519889;view=1up;seq=5

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2010). *HUD historical timeline*. Retrieved from http://www.huduser.org/hud_timeline/

US Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2013). *Choice neighborhoods webinar #2: Local governments as a partner in choice neighborhoods*. Retrieved from: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=webinar2localgov.pdf

Usher, C. (2007). Trust and well-being in the African American neighborhood. *City & Community*, 6(4), 367-387.

Uslaner, M. (2002). *The moral foundations of trust*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Van Vliet, W. (1997). *Affordable housing and urban redevelopment in the United States: Learning from failure and success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van Wormer, K. (2002). Our social work imagination: How social work has not abandoned its mission. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 22*(3/4), 21-37.

Vodde, R., & Gallant, J. P. (2002). Bridging the gap between micro and macro practice: Large scale change and a unified model of narrative-deconstructive practice. *Journal of Social Work Education, 38*(3), 439-458.

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972). The history and status of general systems theory. *Academy of Management Journal, 15*(4), 407-426.

von Hoffman, A. (2003). *House by house, block by block*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

von Hoffman, A. (2012). The past, present, and future of community development in the United States. In N. O. Andrews & D. J. Erickson (Eds.), *Investing in What Works for America's Communities* (pp. 10-54). San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Wakefield, J. C. (1992). Why psychotherapeutic social work don't get no re-Specht. *Social Service Review, 66*(1), 141-151.

Walz, T., & Groze, V. (1991). The mission of social work revisited: An agenda for the 1990s. *Social Work, 36*(6), 500-504.

Wacquant, L. J. D., & Wilson, W. J. (1989). The cost of racial and class exclusion from the inner city. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 501*, 8-25.

Weaver, C. N. (2006). Trust in people among Hispanic Americans. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(5), 1160-1172.

Whaley, D. L., & Weaver, L. (2010). *Approaches to measuring more community engagement*. Waterloo, Ontario: Tamarack.

White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative Report. (2011). *Building neighborhoods of opportunity*. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/uploads /nri_report.pdf

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1997). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York, NY: Random House.

Wise, H. (2012). *Choice neighborhoods planning initiative Shreveport, Louisiana: Needs assessment survey results*. Shreveport, LA: Louisiana State University in Shreveport.

Wratten, E. (1995). Conceptualizing urban poverty. *Environment and Urbanization, 7*(1), 11-33.

Yamagishi, T. (2001). Trust as a form of social intelligence. In K. S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society* (pp. 121-147). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion, 18*(2), 129-166.

Yegidis, B., & Weinbach, R. (2002). *Research methods for social workers* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Yip, W., Subramanian, S. V., & Michell, A. D., Lee, D. T., Wang, J., & Kawachi, I. (2007). Does social capital enhance health and well being? Evidence from rural China. *Social Science & Medicine, 64*(1) 35-49.

Zimmerman, M. (2000). Empowerment theory. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.) *Handbook of Community Psychology* (pp. 43-63). New York, NY: Springer.

APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

Goals of research:
To understand how the Choice Neighborhood planning process and its impact (if any) on residents' perception of their own social capital and well-being (levels of social trust, civic leadership, and associational involvement), and readiness for transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood

Focus Groups Purpose:
To ascertain the residents' vision of what a Choice Neighborhood will look like, and to identify perceived assets and barriers to achieving that vision. Will also discuss the current and ideal perceptions of the civic economy and systems of social trust, and openness and/or resistance to the Choice Neighborhood initiative. **(*One important outcome:** Have residents operationalize local systems of social trust for survey)

Location: Selected based on accessibility and comfort – Galilee City Conference Room

Participant recruitment: Purposive – toward a representative number of males, females, ages, etc.; Convenience sample - word of mouth, and community referral

Data Analysis: Nvivo data analysis software. Data will be transcribed and coded, in order to identify key themes and patterns.

For focus groups: Informed consent forms, one page explanation of Choice Neighborhood, pre-screening instrument, recorder(s)

Agenda for Focus Groups:

- Welcome and introduction
- Explanation of informed consent, obtain signatures
- Explanation of Choice Neighborhood initiative
- Research questions and facilitation of discussion
- Wrap-up

Follow up: Email and/or phone call to thank participants.

Recruitment: Direct personal contacts, individual phone calls from IHSPP LSUS

Phone script for recruiting residents for participation in focus groups:

"Hi, my name is A and I'm calling from LSU-Shreveport. B* is helping with a project we are working on in your neighborhood, and s/he said you might be willing to help us out. We are getting a group of residents together to talk about your neighborhood, things you like about it, ideas you have about what you'd like to see improve. We are having two meetings next Monday, the 13th of February, at Galilee City, in their community center, one at 3 in the afternoon and one at 5:30 in the evening, do you think you can come?"*

A* = Name of person calling

B* = Name of person referring:

If yes, *"Terrific!/Great!/Thank you! – It should last about an hour to an hour and a half. I'd like to follow up with you Monday morning as a reminder, would you like me to email this reminder to you, or give you another call?" – If so, get information – make note of preference*

If no, *"I appreciate your time. Would you be interested in getting involved in the project at a later date? Would you like for me to mail you some information?"*

This should be conversational – rely on the script as little as possible; be friendly, familiar. Participants will be more likely to come if they feel non-threatened, that someone is not trying to sell something to them, that it is an important meeting and the caller takes a conversational approach (Krueger & Casey, 2000).

Follow-up Reminder Call/Email the Day Of: Simple and short –
"Hi. I wanted to call and remind you that we are looking forward to seeing you this afternoon at 3 o'clock (or 6 o'clock) at the Galilee City community room to talk about changes in your neighborhood."

APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

*These are general questions, meant to guide the conversations, that may or may not be applicable to every group, and that will be adapted according to the needs, experiences and interests of different groups. All questions will not necessarily be asked in all sessions.

1. When you think of your neighborhood, what one or two words would you use to describe it?

2. What are the most important things to you that currently make you proud of your neighborhood?

3. What is missing in your neighborhood that could make a difference – that you think would make your life better?

4. How do you feel about a process to come up with a plan to make improvements in your neighborhood?

5. What types of opportunities in the neighborhood are there for getting involved with civic, faith-based and social organizations? Others in the neighborhood?
    a. What makes you want to participate in one of these groups?
    b. What makes you not able to, or not wanting to, participate?

6. When you think about services and amenities in the neighborhood (Health care, education, businesses and retail, job opportunities, other social services, etc), do you feel these are readily available, and that you can access them? Why or why not?

7. When you think about the word "trust", what does it mean to you?
    a. How do you define trust with your neighbors? Do you feel you have a high level of trust with you neighbors?
    b. With your church? Other community groups? High/low?
    c. How do you define trust with local leadership? High/low?
    d. How do you define trust with non profit or community service organizations? High/low?
    e. What people or groups in the neighborhood do you trust the most? High/low?
    f. Do you find it easy or difficult to trust people in your neighborhood of different races? Why?
    g. Do you find it easy or difficult to trust people outside of your neighborhood of different races? Why?

8. When you think again about your neighborhood, what one or two words would you like to see used to describe it?

APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP GUIDING DOCUMENTS

Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods
Focus Group

Date _____
Location _____

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this evaluation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time during the process. If you choose to do so, any information derived from your participation will be deleted from the evaluation finings.

Methods/Procedures

The methods of data collection for this study will be individual surveys and focus groups. The sessions will be audio-taped, and the audio-tapes transcribed, to ensure accurate reporting of the information that you provide. Transcribers will sign a form stating that they will not discuss any item on the tape with anyone other than the researchers. No one's name will be asked or revealed during the focus groups or individual surveys. However, should another participant call you by name, the transcriber will be instructed to remove all names from the transcription. The audio-tapes will be stored in locked files before and after being transcribed. Tapes will be destroyed within 2 weeks of completing the transcriptions and the transcriptions will be destroyed 3 years after the completion of this evaluation.

Please Sign In:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Fold the index card in half and write your first name on it. Turn it to face out.

Introduction:

Hello. I am _____. I will be facilitating the focus group today. This is _____. She will be tape recording the group discussion and taking notes.

The purpose of this focus group is gain an understanding of the perceptions in the neighborhood, related to things in the neighborhood that are good and working, sometimes called assets, and things that are not working, sometimes called areas of need. We also want to understand what the vision of members of this group is for the perfect neighborhood, what that might look like and how to get there.

Do you have any questions about the information shared so far?

Now a set of questions will be asked. Each of you will be given a chance to respond to each question asked. Please try to refrain from talking while someone else is responding. Do you have any questions?

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT

1. Study Title: Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

2. Performance Site: Allendale and Ledbetter Heights Neighborhoods

3. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study,
M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30p.m.
Mary Ellen Brown, LCSW 318-230-2043
Timothy Page, PhD 225-578-1358

4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research project is to gain understanding of the relationship between neighborhood revitalization planning and social capital.

5. Subject Inclusion: Individuals residing in Ledbetter Heights or Allendale ages 18 and older.

6. Number of subjects: 400

7. Study Procedures: The study will be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, participants will be engaged in focus groups or randomly selected to participate in a telephone or household survey, which will take approximately 15-20 minutes. The second phase will be a follow-up to the first phase approximately six months later, identically replicating the initial survey for post-measurement purposes, to see if anything has changed.

8. Benefits: The study may yield valuable information about neighborhood revitalization and how residents feel about it.

9. Risks: The main study risk is the inadvertent release of sensitive information (address or phone number) that is kept in order to follow-up for the post-measurement. However, every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. Files will be kept in secure cabinets to which only the investigator has access, and survey responses will not be linked to this information.

10. Right to Refuse: Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time.

11. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

12. Signatures:
The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board,(225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Subject Signature:_____ Date:_____

The study subject has indicated to me that he/she is unable to read. I certify that I have read this consent form to the subject and explained that by completing the signature line above, the subject has agreed to participate.

Signature of Reader:_____ Date:_____

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL

Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.8792
irb@lsu.edu | lsu.edu/irb

ACTION ON PROTOCOL APPROVAL REQUEST

TO: Timothy Page
Social Work

FROM: Robert C. Mathews
Chair, Institutional Review Board

DATE: August 30, 2011
RE: **IRB#** 3195

TITLE: Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

New Protocol/Modification/Continuation: New Protocol

Review type: Full ___ Expedited _X_ **Review date:** 8/26/2011

Risk Factor: Minimal __X__ Uncertain _____ Greater Than Minimal_____

Approved_____X_____ **Disapproved**_____

Approval Date: 10-10-2011 **Approval Expiration Date:** 10-9-2012

Re-review frequency: (annual unless otherwise stated)

Number of subjects approved: 350-400

Protocol Matches Scope of Work in Grant proposal: (if applicable)_____

By: Robert C. Mathews, Chairman _____

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING –
Continuing approval is CONDITIONAL on:

1. Adherence to the approved protocol, familiarity with, and adherence to the ethical standards of the Belmont Report, and LSU's Assurance of Compliance with DHHS regulations for the protection of human subjects*
2. Prior approval of a change in protocol, including revision of the consent documents or an increase in the number of subjects over that approved.
3. Obtaining renewed approval (or submittal of a termination report), prior to the approval expiration date, upon request by the IRB office (irrespective of when the project actually begins); notification of project termination.
4. Retention of documentation of informed consent and study records for at least 3 years after the study ends.
5. Continuing attention to the physical and psychological well-being and informed consent of the individual participants including notification of new information that might affect consent.
6. A prompt report to the IRB of any adverse event affecting a participant potentially arising from the study.
7. Notification of the IRB of a serious compliance failure.
8. SPECIAL NOTE:

**All investigators and support staff have access to copies of the Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance with DHHS, DHHS (45 CFR 46) and FDA regulations governing use of human subjects, and other relevant documents in print in this office or on our World Wide Web site at http://www.lsu.edu/irb*

Application for Approval of Projects Which Use Human Subjects

This application is used for projects/studies that cannot be reviewed through the exemption process.

Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.6792
irb@lsu.edu
lsu.edu/irb

-- Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include two copies of the competed application as well as parts A-E, listed below. Once the application is completed, please submit to the IRB Office for review and please allow ample time for the application to be reviewed Expedited reviews usually takes 2 weeks. Carefully completed applications should be submitted 3 weeks before a meeting to ensure a prompt decision.

-- A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:

(A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of part B thru E.
(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1&2)
(C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
*If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (http://phrpnihtraining.com/users/login.php.)
(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (http://www.lsu.edu/irb/IRB%20Security%20of%20Data.pdf)

1) Principal Investigator*: Timothy Page, PhD **Rank** Associate Professor

***PI must be** an LSU Faculty Member

Dept: Social Work **Ph:** 225-578-1358 **E-mail:** tpage@lsu.edu

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone, and e-mail for each

Mary Ellen Brown, LCSW
Doctoral Student
School of Social Work
318-230-2043, mbro118@lsu.edu

3) Project Title: Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

4) Proposal Start Date: 10/01/2011 **5) Proposed Duration Months:** 15

6) Number of Subjects Requested: 350-400 **7) LSU Proposal #:** 38179

8) Funding Sought From: Department of Housing and Urban Development

IRB# 3195 LSU Proposal # 38179

- (•) Full
- ( ) Expedited
- ( ) Human Subjects Training
- ( ) Complete Application

Study Approved By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Approval Expires: 10-31-2012

ASSURANCE OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR named above

I accept personal responsibility for the conduct of this study (including ensuring compliance of co-investigators/co-workers) in accordance with the documents submitted herewith and the following guidelines for human subject protection: The Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance (FWA00003892) with OHRP and 45 CFR 46 (available from http://www.lsu.edu/irb). I also understand that copies of all consent forms **must be maintained at LSU for three years after the completion of the project.** If I leave LSU before that time, the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Signature of PI _____ Date 7/12/11

ASSURANCE OF STUDENT/PROJECT COORDINATOR named above. If multiple Co-Investigators, please create a "signature page" for all Co-Investigators to sign. Attach the "signature page" to the application.

I agree to adhere to the terms of this document and am familiar with the documents referenced above.

Signature of Co-PI (s) _____ Date 7/12/11

Study Approved By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Approval Expires: 10-4-2012

1. Study Title: Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

2. Performance Site: Allendale and Ledbetter Heights Neighborhoods

3. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study, M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30p.m.

Mary Ellen Brown, LCSW	318-230-2043
Timothy Page, PhD	225-578-1358

4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research project is to gain understanding of the relationship between neighborhood revitalization planning and social capital.

5. Subject Inclusion: Individuals residing in Ledbetter Heights or Allendale ages 18 and older.

6. Number of subjects: 400

7. Study Procedures: The study will be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, participants will be engaged in focus groups or randomly selected to participate in a telephone or household survey, which will take approximately 15-20 minutes. The second phase will be a follow-up to the first phase approximately six months later, identically replicating the initial survey for post-measurement purposes, to see if anything has changed.

8. Benefits: The study may yield valuable information about neighborhood revitalization and how residents feel about it.

9. Risks: The main study risk is the inadvertent release of sensitive information (address or phone number) that is kept in order to follow-up for the post-measurement. However, every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. Files will be kept in secure cabinets to which only the investigator has access, and survey responses will not be linked to this information.

10. Right to Refuse: Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time.

11. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

12. Signatures:
The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board,(225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Subject Signature:_____ Date:_____

The study subject has indicated to me that he/she is unable to read. I certify that I have read this consent form to the subject and explained that by completing the signature line above, the subject has agreed to participate.
Signature of Reader:_____ Date:_____

*This is a sample of what will be used for the telephone survey consent script. Once the survey tool has been developed, an updated and final version of the consent script will be submitted to the IRB board.

Interviewer: Hi, my name is (interviewer name), and I am calling because you have been randomly selected to participate in a telephone survey for a research study about your neighborhood. Our survey is being conducted from LSU's School of Social Work, as a way to learn more about what people think about the revitalization program going on in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods. The revitalization program is called Choice Neighborhood, and we're studying what residents may know about it and what their feelings are about the impact it may have on their lives. We're only surveying residents 18 years of age or older.

This survey is voluntary, and if you agree to participate, will take approximately 15-20 minutes of your time. We will protect your privacy; your responses will be handled confidentially, and you will never be publicly identified as a participant. Any information we share about the findings of this survey, such as reports we may write, will be made available to you. This study has been approved by the LSU IRB. For questions concerning participants' rights, please contact the IRB Chair, Dr. Robert C. Mathews, 578-8692, or irb@lsu.edu.

Do you have any questions at this time?

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

If no, then: Thank you for your time. If you have any questions about this research, please contact the investigator, Mary Ellen Brown, at 225-578-0428.

If yes, then: Before proceeding to the survey, do you have any questions for me about this research?

Interviewer documents on data sheet: (1) script was read; (2) individual was offered the opportunity to ask questions; (3) individual agreed or declined to participate in the study.

Study Approved By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Approval Expires: 10-9-2009

APPENDIX F: SURVEY TRAINING MATERIALS

Choice Neighborhoods

Surveyor Application Form

Contact Information

Name: _____
Primary Phone Number: _____
Secondary Phone Number: _____
Address: _____
Email: _____

Job Requirements

Work begins March 26 to April 28, 2012, from 10am-3pm Tuesday through Saturday of each week.

There will be a mandatory training meeting Friday, March 23rd from 9am-11am, which all successful applicants must attend.

Are you physically able to walk for the full five (5) hour work days?

Yes No

Do you speak any language other than English?

No Yes, I speak _____

Do you have any relevant surveying or door-to-door solicitation experience? Please explain:

_____

_____

_____

Additional Information

Have you ever been convicted of a felony? Yes No

Please list one reference that we may contact to verify this information:

Name: _____
Relation: _____
Phone Number: _____

How did you hear about this opportunity?

_____

Survey Administration Script

Hi, I'm _____. I'm helping LSUS along with the Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments and the Department of Community Development to conduct a neighborhood survey. We are doing this to understand the strengths and needs of our community. The survey asks questions about our neighborhood, housing, and the people who live here. The information you give us will be used to plan projects to benefit the neighborhood. We'd like to have you complete a short survey. Would you like to participate?

[IF NO, ASK IF THEY WOULD LIKE TO COMPLETE A MAIL SURVEY. IF YES, YOU CAN LEAVE IT WITH THE RESIDENT ALONG WITH A CONSENT FORM AND THEN MOVE ON TO THE NEXT HOUSE.
IF NO, ASK IF THEY WOULD LIKE TO COMPLETE A TELEPHONE SURVEY AND RECORD THIS ON YOUR ROUTE SHEET ALONG WITH THEIR PHONE NUMBER
IF THE ANSWER IS STILL NO, THANK THEM FOR THEIR TIME, MARK THIS ON YOUR ROUTE SHEET, AND MOVE ON.
IF YES, ASK THEM WHERE THEY'D FEEL MOST COMFORTABLE COMPLETING THE SURVEY]]

The first page describes the purpose of the survey. Would you like me to read it out loud?
[IF YES, READ THE CONSENT FORM; IF NO, CONTINUE ON]
Do you have any questions? Please print your name and address in capital letters at the bottom of the first page. Please print clearly. We will immediately separate that page from your survey when we receive it so, that your name will not be kept with your answers.
[ONCE COMPLETE, SEPARATE THE CONSENT FORM FROM THE SURVEY]

Do you have any questions about how to complete the survey?

IF THEY WISH TO COMPLETE PRIVATELY: When you finish your survey, please review it to make sure that you did not skip any questions that you did not mean to. Put your survey packet in the envelope and seal it shut before giving it back to me.

[WHEN THE PARTICIPANT IS FINISHED] Do you have any questions or comments related to the survey?

When not to leave a survey

What if no one is home and the house looks abandoned?
Mark it on the route sheet and move on to the next house.

What if not one is home, but it looks like someone lives there?
Leave a flyer that says, "sorry we missed you." DO NOT leave a survey or envelope

What is there are no adults home?
Ask when someone might be back and mark it on the route sheet.

What if someone is home but they don't want to do the survey right now?
Ask what would be a good day and time to return. If they say no, see below for the instructions.

When to leave a survey

If a resident agrees to complete a survey but doesn't have time right now, they have two options:

1) You can return in 30 minutes to one hour to collect the survey
2) Leave a full survey, consent form and stamped envelope

Note what you did on the route sheet. Do not leave surveys with residents to be picked up the next day. If they cannot complete the survey during the current day, leave the envelope along with the other material. You need to write their address over the return address on the envelope or on the back of the survey so that we can exclude them from follow-up contact.

Still refusing?
Offer to take their phone number and let them know that we can call them to complete the survey. Put this on the route sheet.

When in doubt, skip the house and mark it for follow-up on the route sheet.

APPENDIX G: TIME 1 SURVEY

ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD: Listed below are statements about access to different services and things your neighborhood. Access means that you could use these if you wanted to. With a "1" being the worst or least important and 4 being the best or most important, tell us how you feel about each of the following:

1 = completely unimportant/completely unsatisfied 2 = unimportant/unsatisfied 3 = important/satisfied 4 = very important/very satisfied								
	How important is this to you…				How satisfied are you with…			
Access to good grocery stores	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable day care centers	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to parks and recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to public transportation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to youth employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to drug stores	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to health care	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to gas stations	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to Laundromats	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to quality housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to local businesses	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to information about education and training programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to education and training programs in the neighborhood	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to information if you didn't know where to go for help	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Quality of teaching at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Safety at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Well lit streets	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Response time of police to emergency calls	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Timely garbage collection	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity to participate in religious activities at local churches	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The city's response to sanitation (pests – rats, raccoons, trash, etc)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The use of speed bumps to reduce speeding	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Neighbors taking care of the appearance of their homes	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunities to work in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your neighborhood:

	Strong Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
There is a lot trash and litter on the streets	1	2	3	4	5
There is a lot of noise	1	2	3	4	5
Homes and other buildings are well-maintained	1	2	3	4	5
Street signs, lighting and sidewalks are maintained	1	2	3	4	5
I feel safe walking in my neighborhood, day or night	1	2	3	4	5
Violence and crime are <u>not</u> a problem in my neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
It is pleasant to walk or run outside	1	2	3	4	5
I often see children and other people playing or exercising outside	1	2	3	4	5
Parks and playgrounds are well-maintained and safe	1	2	3	4	5

These questions are about you and your family's HEALTH

In the past 7 days, has your family eaten a meal together that was prepared at home?				Yes	No
Would you participate in neighborhood healthy eating programs if they were offered? (like nutrition education, cooking classes)				Yes	No
Would you participate in neighborhood physical activity programs if they were offered? (walking, weightlifting, aerobics, yoga, dancing classes)				Yes	No
Was there any time when you needed medical, dental, or vision services or prescription drugs, but didn't get them because you couldn't afford it?				Yes	No
Was there any time when you needed mental health, substance abuse counseling/treatment, or other health-related support but didn't get it because you couldn't afford it?				Yes	No
How would you describe your overall state of health?	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
All things considered, would you say you are very happy, happy, not very happy, or not happy at all?		Very happy	Happy	Not very happy	Not happy at all
Are there children under the age of 18 who live in the home?		Yes		No *If no, go to last question on this page.*	
Thinking of your youngest, school aged child, please answer the following questions?					
During the past week how many days was this child physically active for at least 60 minutes at a time? (For example, walking, running, playing active sports or games, lifting weights)					
Where were they the most active (such as community, community center, school, parks, recreational areas, backyard)? List all.					
How many times did they eat breakfast?					
Where did they most often get that breakfast?			Home	School	Fast food
In the past 7 days did this child:					
Drink a can, bottle or glass of soda or pop?		Yes	No	Not sure	
Did this child eat vegetables (for example, green salad, potatoes, and carrots?		Yes	No	Not sure	
If yes, How often?	Less than 1 a day	1 a day	2 a day	3+ a day	
Eat fresh or canned fruits (not including fruit juice)		Yes	No	Not sure	
If yes, How much?	Less than 1 a day	1 a day	2 a day	3+ a day	
Did this child eat fast food?		Yes	No	Not sure	
If yes, How often?	Several times each day	Everyday	A few days	Once or twice a week	

What prevent you and your family from using existing HEALTH and FAMILY SUPPORT services in the neighborhood? (check all that apply)

- ○ Services/programs are not helpful
- ○ Too hard to get to
- ○ Not open or available when convenient
- ○ Too expensive
- ○ Takes too long to get the service/program
- ○ No transportation
- ○ No childcare available
- ○ I am uncomfortable or embarrassed to use
- ○ Other_____

These questions are about you and your household's JOB & EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES: These first questions ask about Adults only. How satisfied are you with the following ADULT EDUCATION and JOB services in the neighborhood

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know	Doesn't exist in neighborhood
Job education and training						
Help with finding a job						
Help with getting ready for a job search						
Available jobs						
Transportation to work						
Adult literacy/GED services						
Help with things like childcare or transportation in a job search						
Help with things like childcare or transportation while working						
Opportunities to start small businesses						
Financial education						

What prevent neighborhood residents from using existing ADULT EDUCATION and JOB services in the neighborhood? (check all that apply)

- o Services/programs are not helpful
- o Too hard to get
- o Not open or available when convenient
- o Too expensive
- o Takes too long to get the service or program
- o No transportation
- o No Childcare available
- o Staff are not friendly
- o I am uncomfortable or embarrassed to use
- o Other_____

These questions are about Children's Education only. How satisfied are you with the following YOUTH EDUCATION and SUPPORT in the neighborhood?

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know	Doesn't exist in neighborhood
School options in the neighborhood						
Mentor programs for children and youth						
College preparation for youth						
College support (scholarships, financing, mentoring)						
Youth job opportunities						
Church youth groups						
Supervised after school activities or sports for children and youth						

Where can you get online (e.g. the Internet or Web) on computer? (*Please check all that apply)*

- My home computer
- My cell phone
- My workplace
- Local library
- Nearby school, college, university
- Community center or community organization
- Other
- I can't or don't get online

If you can get online, do you have an email address you would be willing to share? If not, skip to next set of questions

- If yes, enter email address here :_____

Would you be willing to be contacted for follow-up surveys in one to six months?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

These questions are about CHILDREN, CHILDCARE & EDUCATION:

How many children under age 18 live in your household? _____ **If none, please skip to next page.**

What type(s) of child care arrangements do you have for your child(ren)? (Check all that apply)

- Attends a part-day Preschool program
- Attends a Head Start program
- Attends school in grades K-12
- Attends child care in a professional center
- Attends child care in a private home
- Before school care
- After school care
- Attends Summer programs
- Receives child care in your own home from yourself, other family, or friends/neighbors
- At after school programs in their school
- At a Boys and Girls Club, recreation center, or other organization that provides activities after school
- Hanging out with their own friends
- They take care of themselves
- At home or at a relative's house taking care of younger children
- At work at their own job
- Other (SPECIFY) _____

Please tell me your level of agreement with the following statements about your child's school or education:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The report cards and important papers from my child's school are easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel like I could call my child's teachers if I wanted to know how my child was doing.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel welcome in my child's school.	1	2	3	4	5
I often set limits on the way my children spend their time	1	2	3	4	5
I ask about what went on at school each day	1	2	3	4	5
I spend time with my child on homework	1	2	3	4	5

These questions are about you and your NEIGHBORS:

	Very close	Close	Somewhat close	Not close at all	Not Sure
How connected would you say you are to your neighbors?	1	2	3	4	5
For the following, to what degree do you feel that:					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not sure
I live in a close-knit neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
People around here are willing to help their neighbors	1	2	3	4	5
People in my neighborhood generally get along with each other	1	2	3	4	5
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
In general, how much do you trust people in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust the police in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust local government?	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you **get** help or support, like babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides from people in your family that do not live with you?	1	2	3	4	5
Do these family members live in your neighborhood?			Yes	No	Not sure
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
How often do you **give** help or support to people in your family that do not live with you?	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you **get** help or support from friends?	1	2	3	4	5
Do these family members live in your neighborhood?			Yes	No	Not sure
How often do you **give** help or support to your friends?	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
For the following questions, please answer how often you have done certain things **in the past 6 months**, if at all.					
	Never	Once or twice	Once a month	Once a week or more	Not sure
How often have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community?	1	2	3	4	5
How often have you attended a public meeting in which there was a discussion of neighborhood or school affairs?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you had friends over to your house?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of someone you consider to be a community leader or had one in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?	1	2	3	4	5
How interested are you in local politics?	1	2	3	4	5
In the past 6 months have you served as an officer or served on a committee of			Yes		No

any local or neighborhood club, religious, or school-related organization?		
Do you attend religious services inside your neighborhood, or outside your neighborhood? SKIP if you do not regularly attend services (once a month or more)	Inside neighborhood	Outside neighborhood
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No
To your knowledge, has there been any sort of neighborhood get together during the past year (festival, celebration, cook-out, block party)?	Yes	No
Did you attend?	Yes	No

Thinking about the future of your neighborhood, would you say that your neighborhood in the next five years will:	Change for the better	Change for the worse	Stay the same	Not sure
If you could live in another neighborhood in Shreveport besides this one, would you move?	Yes	No	Unsure	
Do you feel like you and your household have the ability to improve or make decisions that affect your neighborhood?	Yes	No	Unsure	

What is the one thing you wish your neighborhood had but doesn't?

_____

_____

What is one word that you would use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is one word that you wish you could use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is the one thing in your neighborhood that you are most proud of? _____

To finish, we would like to ask you question about yourself and those in your household to be sure we are talking to all kinds of residents.
How old are you?_____
What is your gender? (mark if you are reading)
- o Female
- o Male
- o I do not want to answer

Which of the following best describes you currently?
- o Single
- o Have a partner
- o Married
- o Widowed
- o Divorced
- o Separated
- o I do not want to answer

What is your ethnicity or race (*Please check all that are true for you*)?

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Other (specify)_____
- I do not want to answer

What is the highest degree or level of school that ANYONE (including you) in your household has completed? If you are currently enrolled, please indicate where:

- Less than a high school degree
- Regular high school diploma
- GED or alternative credential: _____
- Some college, 2 or 4 year university or college : _____
- Associate degree: _____
- College degree: _____
- More than a college degree: _____

How many people currently live in your household? _____
How many adults (aged 18 years and older) live in your household? _____
Do you own or rent this home? _____
How long have you lived in this home? _____
How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____

How many people age 16 and older in your home have a :

Part-time job (less than 30 hours per week)	Full-time job (35 or more hours per week)
None	None
One	One
Two	Two
Three or more	Three or more

Which one of the following income supports does your household receive? (Check all that apply)

- None
- Medicaid
- Medicare
- Housing Program/Assistance
- Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- Food Stamps
- Employment Related Day Care (ERDC)
- Unemployment
- Disability
- Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)
- Child support
- Other (please specify)
- I do not want to answer

Household income is the income from all sources. Which category best describes your household's last year's income?

- Less than $15,000
- Between $15,000 and $25,000
- Between $25,000 and $50, 0000
- More than $50,000
- I do not want to answer

APPENDIX H: TIME 2 SURVEY

APPENDIX H: TIME 2 SURVEY

ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD: Listed below are statements about access to different services and things your neighborhood. Access means that you could use these if you wanted to. With a "1" being the worst or least important and 4 being the best or most important, tell us how you feel about each of the following:

1 = completely unimportant/completely unsatisfied 2 = unimportant/unsatisfied 3 = important/satisfied 4 = very important/very satisfied								
	How important is this to you…				How satisfied are you with…			
Access to good grocery stores	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable day care centers	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to parks and recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to public transportation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to youth employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to drug stores	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to health care	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to gas stations	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to Laundromats	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to quality housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to local businesses	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to information about education and training programs	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to education and training programs in the neighborhood	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to information if you didn't know where to go for help	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Quality of teaching at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Safety at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Well lit streets	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Response time of police to emergency calls	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Timely garbage collection	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity to participate in religious activities at local churches	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The city's response to sanitation (pests – rats, raccoons, trash, etc)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The use of speed bumps to reduce speeding	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Neighbors taking care of the appearance of their homes	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunities to work in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

These questions are about you and your NEIGHBORS:

	Very close	Close	Somewhat close	Not close at all	Not Sure
How connected would you say you are to your neighbors?	1	2	3	4	5
For the following, to what degree do you feel that:					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not sure
I live in a close-knit neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
People around here are willing to help their neighbors	1	2	3	4	5

People in my neighborhood generally get along with each other	1	2	3	4	5
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
In general, how much do you trust people in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust the police in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust local government?	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you **get** help or support, like babysitting, lending small appliances, and rides from people in your family that do not live with you?	1	2	3	4	5
Do these family members live in your neighborhood?			Yes	No	Not sure
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
How often do you **give** help or support to people in your family that do not live with you?	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you **get** help or support from friends?	1	2	3	4	5
Do these family members live in your neighborhood?			Yes	No	Not sure
How often do you **give** help or support to your friends?	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure

For the following questions, please answer how often you have done certain things **in the past 6 months**, if at all.

	Never	Once or twice	Once a month	Once a week or more	Not sure
How often have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community?	1	2	3	4	5
How often have you attended a public meeting in which there was a discussion of neighborhood or school affairs?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you had friends over to your house?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of a friend of a different race or had them in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of someone of a different neighborhood or had them in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
How many times in the past year have you been in the home of someone you consider to be a community leader or had one in your home?	1	2	3	4	5
Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?	1	2	3	4	5
How interested are you in local politics?	1	2	3	4	5

In the past 6 months have you served as an officer or served on a committee of any local or neighborhood club, religious, or school-related organization?	Yes	No
Do you attend religious services inside your neighborhood, or outside your neighborhood? SKIP if you do not regularly attend services (once a month or more)	Inside neighborhood	Outside neighborhood
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No

To your knowledge, has there been any sort of neighborhood get together during the past year (festival, celebration, cook-out, block party)?		Yes		No
Did you attend?		Yes		No
Thinking about the future of your neighborhood, would you say that your neighborhood in the next five years will:	Change for the better	Change for the worse	Stay the same	Not sure
If you could live in another neighborhood in Shreveport besides this one, would you move?	Yes	No	Unsure	
Do you feel like you and your household have the ability to improve or make decisions that affect your neighborhood?	Yes	No	Unsure	

What is the one thing you wish your neighborhood had but doesn't?

_____

_____

What is one word that you would use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is one word that you wish you could use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is the one thing in your neighborhood that you are most proud of? _____

To finish, we would like to ask you question about yourself and those in your household to be sure we are talking to all kinds of residents.
How old are you?_____
What is your gender? (mark if you are reading)
- o Female
- o Male
- o I do not want to answer

Which of the following best describes you currently?
- o Single
- o Have a partner
- o Married
- o Widowed
- o Divorced
- o Separated
- o I do not want to answer

What is your ethnicity or race (*Please check all that are true for you*)?
- o White
- o Black or African American
- o Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- o Other (specify)_____
- o I do not want to answer

What is the highest degree or level of school that ANYONE (including you) in your household has completed? If you are currently enrolled, please indicate where:
- o Less than a high school degree
- o Regular high school diploma
- o GED or alternative credential: _____

- Some college, 2 or 4 year university or college : _____
- Associate degree: _____
- College degree: _____
- More than a college degree: _____

How many people currently live in your household? _____
How many adults (aged 18 years and older) live in your household? _____
Do you own or rent this home? _____
How long have you lived in this home? _____
How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____

How many people age 16 and older in your home have a :

Part-time job (less than 30 hours per week)	Full-time job (35 or more hours per week)
None	None
One	One
Two	Two
Three or more	Three or more

Which one of the following income supports does your household receive? (Check all that apply)

- None
- Medicaid
- Medicare
- Housing Program/Assistance
- Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)
- Food Stamps
- Employment Related Day Care (ERDC)
- Unemployment
- Disability
- Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)
- Child support
- Other (please specify)
- I do not want to answer

Household income is the income from all sources. Which category best describes your household's last year's income?

- Less than $15,000
- Between $15,000 and $25,000
- Between $25,000 and $50, 0000
- More than $50,000
- I do not want to answer

APPENDIX I: TIME 1 SURVEY – SHORT FORM (MAIL SURVEY)

Dear Resident,

An exciting project is happening in your neighborhood and we need your help! A few weeks ago, you received a survey regarding Choice Neighborhoods. To be sure that we are hearing from all residents, we are asking that you take a moment to complete a new, shorter survey.

The Institute for Human Services and Public Policy at LSU Shreveport is conducting a neighborhood needs assessment for the Choice Neighborhoods Planning Grant awarded through HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development). The Lead Applicant of the grant is NLCOG (Northwestern Louisiana Council of Governments) and the Co-Applicant is the Department of Community Development, City of Shreveport. As part of this needs assessment, we are conducting a mail survey of residents in Allendale and Ledbetter Heights. We are doing this to understand the strengths and needs of our community. The survey asks questions about our neighborhood, housing, and the people who live here. The information you give us will be used to plan projects to benefit the neighborhood. We would like to have you complete a short survey. Your input as a resident of Allendale/Ledbetter Heights is crucial to the success of this planning project and we appreciate the time you are willing to devote to this project.

A copy of the survey can also be found in this packet. Please answer the questions to the best of your ability. When you finish your survey, please review it to make sure that you did not skip any questions that you did not mean to. Put your survey packet in the envelope and seal it shut before giving mailing it back. For your convenience, we have included a stamped, self-addressed envelope. **Please return the survey by Thursday, July 5. Again, your participation is critical to the success of the project and we thank you in advance for your participation.**

Helen K. Wise

Helen K. Wise, PhD
Director of Research, IHSPP
LSU Shreveport

One University Place
Shreveport, LA 71115 *Telephone (318) 795-4264 www.lsus.edu/ihspp*

- **What is the project and who is involved?**

CHOICE Neighborhoods is a grant from HUD that Shreveport was awarded. The goal of this project is to come up with a plan for the neighborhood based on WHAT RESIDENTS WANT.

- W**hat is this research about?**

A survey of residents is taking place over the next few weeks and it is important that we talk to as many residents as possible. The purpose of the project is to conduct household surveys with residents of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights. The project is part of a broader effort of the **CHOICE Neighborhood Planning Initiative** to research resident views about housing, the neighborhood and the people who live in the neighborhood.

- **What does the survey cover?**

There are questions about jobs, education, access to things like grocery stores, drug stores and gas stations, health and your views about the neighborhood. If you choose to participate, your household will answer the following questions about safety, education, health, economic development, jobs, and other community issues. Then you may use the stamped and addressed envelope to return your completed survey. The answers will be sent to a secure database maintained by The Institute for Human Services and Public Policy at LSU in Shreveport and your name will not be associated with the survey.

- **How will my privacy be protected?** Participation in this project is voluntary.

You may discontinue participation at any time and may choose to answer some but not all the questions. You will not be penalized should you decide not to take the survey or to skip some of the questions. Some information you give us is personal, and there is always the possibility that someone who is not authorized might see it. We take the following precautions to prevent that from happening.

1. We will not share your information with anyone. We do not store answers with identifying information.
2. All hard copies of the data will be kept locked up and only authorized staff will have access to the information. All project staff have been trained to protect confidentiality and have signed agreements indicating such.
3. The only exception to our promise of privacy is that if we have reason to suspect: 1) abuse, neglect, or endangerment of a child or elder; 2) or that anyone is in immediate danger of seriously hurting himself/herself or someone else, we are required to report this to the appropriate authorities.

You have the right to refuse participation in the survey. If you have questions about the research at any time, or if you require this material in another format, please contact Helen Wise or Stacey Martino at LSU Shreveport IHSPP (318)795-4264.

I have read the information and voluntarily agree to participate in the study described above.

Your Signature: _____ Date: _____

Street Address:_____

Zip Code:_____

ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD: Listed below are statements about access to different services and things your neighborhood. Access means that you could use these if you wanted to. With "1" being the worst or least important and 4 being the best or most important, tell us how you feel about each of the following:

1 = completely unimportant/completely unsatisfied **3** = important/satisfied
2 = unimportant/unsatisfied **4** = very important/very satisfied

	How important is this to you…				How satisfied are you with…			
Access to good grocery stores	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable day care centers	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to parks and recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to public transportation	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to health care	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to affordable housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to quality housing	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Access to local businesses	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Neighbors taking care of the appearance of their homes	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunities to work in your neighborhood	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Safety at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Quality of teaching at schools	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your neighborhood:	Strong Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
There is a lot trash and litter on the streets	1	2	3	4	5
Street signs, lighting and sidewalks are maintained	1	2	3	4	5
I feel safe walking in my neighborhood, day or night	1	2	3	4	5
Violence and crime are not a problem in my neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
I often see children and others playing or exercising outside	1	2	3	4	5
Parks and playgrounds are well-maintained and safe	1	2	3	4	5

About JOB & EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES:

How satisfied are you with the following **ADULT EDUCATION and JOB Services** in the neighborhood?	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Job education and training				
Help with finding a job				
Transportation to work				
Adult literacy/GED services				
Help with things like childcare or transportation in a job search				
Help with things like childcare or transportation while working				
Opportunities to start small businesses				
Financial education				

How satisfied are you with the following **YOUTH EDUCATION and SUPPORT** in the neighborhood?	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
School options in the neighborhood				
College preparation for youth				
College support (scholarships, financing, mentoring)				
Supervised after school activities or sports for				

children and youth				

How many children under age 18 live in your household? _____ **If none, please skip the table below.**

Please tell me your level of agreement with the following statements about your **CHILD'S SCHOOL/EDUCATION**:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The report cards and important papers from my child's school are easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
I feel like I could call my child's teachers if I wanted to know how my child was doing	1	2	3	4	5
I feel welcome in my child's school	1	2	3	4	5
I often set limits on the way my children spend their time	1	2	3	4	5
I ask about what went on at school each day	1	2	3	4	5
I spend time with my child on homework	1	2	3	4	5

About you and your NEIGHBORS:

For the following questions, to what degree do you feel that:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not sure
I live in a close-knit neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5
People around here are willing to help their neighbors	1	2	3	4	5
People in my neighborhood generally get along with each other	1	2	3	4	5
	A lot	Some	A little	Not at all	Not sure
In general, how much do you trust people in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust the police in your neighborhood?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you trust local government?	1	2	3	4	5

For the following questions, please answer how often you have done certain things in the past 6 months, if at all.	Never	Once or twice	Once a month	Once a week or more	Not sure
How often have you volunteered or helped out with activities in your community?	1	2	3	4	5
How often have you attended a public meeting in which there was a discussion of neighborhood or school affairs?	1	2	3	4	5
Not including weddings and funerals, how often do you attend religious services?	1	2	3	4	5

Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a local political official about a neighborhood problem or improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No
Have you (or anyone in your household) ever gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement?	Yes	No
To your knowledge, has there been any sort of neighborhood get together during the past year (festival, celebration, cook-out, block party)?	Yes	No
Did you attend?	Yes	No

Thinking about the future of your neighborhood, would you say that your neighborhood in the next five years will: (please circle your response)

Change for the better	Change for the worse	Stay the same	Not sure

If you could live in another neighborhood in Shreveport besides this one, would you move? (please circle one)

Yes No Unsure

Do you feel like you and your household have the ability to improve or make decisions that affect your neighborhood? (please circle one)

Yes No Unsure

What is the one thing you wish your neighborhood had but doesn't?

_____

What is <u>one word</u> you would use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is <u>one word</u> you wish you could use to describe your neighborhood? _____

What is the one thing in your neighborhood that you are most proud of? _____

To finish, we would like to ask you question about yourself and those in your household to be sure we are talking to all kinds of residents.

How old are you? _____ **What is your gender** (circle one)? Female Male

Which of the following best describes you currently? (circle one)

Single	Have a partner	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Separated

What is your ethnicity or race? (*Please circle all that are true for you*)

Black or African American	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	White	Other:

What is the highest degree or level of school that ANYONE (including you) in your household has completed?

Less than a high school degree	Regular high school diploma	GED or alternative credential	Some college	Associate degree	College degree	More than a college degree

How many people currently live in your household? _____

How many adults (ages 18 years and older) live in your household? _____

Do you own or rent this home? _____

How long you lived in this home? _____

How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____

How many people age 16 and older in your home have a job?(circle response):

Part-time job (less than 30 hours per week)				*Full-time job (35 or more hours per week)*			
None	1	2	3+	None	1	2	3+

Which, if any, of the following supports does your household receive? (Circle all that apply)

Housing Program/Assistance	Employment Related Day Care (ERDC)
Medicare	Unemployment
Medicaid	Disability
Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)	Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC)
Food Stamps	Child support

Other supports? (please specify): _____.

Which category best describes your household's last year's income? (please check one)

- Less than $15,000
- Between $15,000 and $25,000
- Between $25,000 and $50, 0000
- More than $50,000
- I do not want to answer

APPENDIX J: "SORRY WE MISSED YOU" TIME 1 AND TIME 2

Choice Neighborhoods

Sorry we missed you today!

To learn more about the project going on in your neighborhood, see the information to the right.

Need Additional Information?

Contact us by Email
Coordinator@choiceneighborhoodsshreveport.org
Chloe.Duplessis@shreveportla.gov

Contact us by Telephone:
(318) 673-7521

Follow us on Facebook
https://www.facebook.com/shreveportchoiceneighborhoods

North Louisiana Council of Governments
http://www.nlcog.org/

Department of Community Development, City of Shreveport
http://www.shreveportla.gov/dept/cd/index.htm

A **What is the project and who is involved?**
CHOICE Neighborhoods is a grant to from HUD that Shreveport was awarded. This goal of this project is to come up with a plan for the neighborhood based on WHAT RESIDENTS WANT.

A **What is this research about?**
A survey of residents is taking place over the next few weeks and it is important that we talk to as many residents as possible.

A **What does the survey cover?**
There are questions about jobs, education, access to things like grocery stores, drug stores and gas stations, health and your views about the neighborhood.

A **Who will be surveyed?**
Adult residents of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights. But just one per household.

A **When will the survey take place?**
Surveying starts on Tuesday, March 27, 2012. We will generally be surveying from Tuesday to Saturday between the hours of 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. We will not be surveying on Friday, Saturday, Sunday or the following Monday after Holy Week. The surveyors will be in the neighborhood until around April 21, 2012.

A **What if I don't want to do the survey?**
That's okay, but we would ask that if you don't want to have surveyors come to you house, you consider a mail or telephone survey.

A **How will this information be used?**
The information collected from residents will be combined with other forms of information such as Census data and other publically available data to begin to identify projects that can help the neighborhood. No information from specific households will be identified.

Choice Neighborhoods

ALLENDALE · LEDBETTER · WEST EDGE

Planning for Our Community...Our Home.

Sorry we missed you today!

To learn more about the project going on in your neighborhood, see the information to the right.

Need Additional Information?

Contact us by Email
helen.wise@lsus.edu

Contact us by Telephone:
IHSPP: 318-798-4264

Follow us on Facebook
https://www.facebook.com/shreveportchoiceneighborhoods

North Louisiana Council of Governments
http://www.nlcog.org/

Department of Community Development, City of Shreveport
http://www.shreveportla.gov/dept/cd/index.htm

Last spring you participated in an initial survey, and indicated that we may contact you for follow-up. The shorter follow-up survey focuses on how you feel on relationships in your neighborhood. We will be contacting you by mail shortly.

- **What is the project and who is involved?**
  CHOICE Neighborhoods is a grant to from HUD that Shreveport was awarded. This goal of this project is to come up with a plan for the neighborhood based on WHAT RESIDENTS WANT.

- **What is this research about?**
  A survey of residents is taking place over the next few weeks and it is important that we talk to as many residents as possible.

- **What if I don't want to do the survey?**
  That's okay, but we would ask that if you don't want to have surveyors come to you house, you consider a mail or telephone survey.

- **How will this information be used?**
  The information collected from residents will be combined with other forms of information such as Census data and other publically available data to begin to identify projects that can help the neighborhood. No information from specific households will be identified.

APPENDIX K: HUD DISSERTATION GRANT NARRATIVE

Investing in the Civic Economy: Social Capital and Choice Neighborhoods

1. Rating Factor 1: *Capacity to do the Research*

a. The doctoral student applicant, Ms. Mary Ellen Brown, is a licensed clinical social worker, who possesses the professional experience, community contacts, institutional support, research skills and expertise necessary to successfully carry out the research described in this proposal, and she is poised to begin immediately. In the past three years, Ms. Brown has completed over 61 hours of coursework at Louisiana State University (LSU) in pursuit of her doctorate in social work, with one course outstanding to earn a dual degree master's in public administration, carrying an overall GPA of 3.8. In her coursework, she has demonstrated mastery of the concepts of research design, descriptive statistics, correlation, quantitative statistical analysis methods, including regression analysis and other multivariate techniques, and process and outcome evaluations. Her qualitative research training includes grounded theory methodology and participatory action research, and she has experience utilizing various qualitative fieldwork techniques including case studies, interviewing, focus groups and content analysis.

Titles of recent research coursework Ms. Brown has completed include Qualitative Methods in Educational Research, Seminar in Research Design and Quantitative Techniques, Advanced Data Analysis and Research Management for Social Work Research, Program Evaluation, Issues and Research Problems in Social Policy, Issues and Research Problems in Social Work Intervention, and a Research Practicum. Ms. Brown holds her Master's in Social Work from the University of South Carolina (USC), where she earned the Outstanding Graduate Student of the Year award in 2004. She received a scholarship from USC to attend specialized training from Research Associates in Columbia, SC. Ms. Brown has received formal training in the use of

statistical software programs, including SPSS and STATA, and she has applied that knowledge for numerous projects in her role as a research assistant for LSU.

b. Ms. Brown has been a research assistant since the fall of 2008. She has gained a wealth of experience and research proficiency in this role, and is adept at ethically handling sensitive data. Her first assignment was assisting with the data entry and analysis of a survey-based instrument utilizing SPSS, to understand the reporting habits, readiness to report, and systems of trust for sexual assault survivors in Kenya, Africa. The following year she assisted in the development, facilitation and evaluation of a Client Satisfaction Survey for the Capital Area Human Services District (CAHSD), an agency providing community-based services in a 7-parish region of Louisiana. Ms. Brown had a principal role in developing the survey instrument, training staff, and facilitating data collection. She attended specialized training in MS Access, and developed a database to track survey distribution and collection, to ensure efficiency in the process. In her Research Practicum she assisted with data analysis and the final report for the CAHSD project. Last year, Ms. Brown was selected to work for the Family Impact Seminars. This initiative is a nonpartisan approach providing research to state policymakers on issues impacting vulnerable children, and Ms. Brown analyzed state policy and designed the Seminar evaluation instrument.

Since 2011, Ms. Brown has been retained as a research assistant for the Office of Social Service Research and Development (OSSRD) at LSU. She is responsible for assistance with special projects, with responsibilities including statistical analyses, literature reviews and assistance with scholarly writing. She has experience teaching, and in the summer of 2011, she taught Social Work 3002: The Child and The Community, at LSU. She has also taught Sociology 392: Seminar in Non-Profit Organizations, at LSU-Shreveport (LSUS), and continues to teach online courses for LSUS's Non-Profit Management Certificate Program.

Prior to pursuing her doctorate, Ms. Brown served as the Director of the Institute for Human Services and Public Policy (IHSPP) at LSUS. In this position, she provided leadership for IHSPP in its academic, applied research, American Humanics and service learning programs, and non-profit administration, capacity building and program evaluation services. IHSPP specializes in conducting survey research and statistical analysis for businesses, nonprofits, and governmental entities. As Director and Social Scientist in Residence at IHSPP, Ms. Brown has had extensive experience in managing state and federal grants, designing research studies, and has honed her skills at executing program evaluations, conducting focus groups, and administering surveys.

In this DDRGP research proposal, Ms. Brown offers a unique connection with the City of Shreveport's HUD Choice Neighborhood initiative. Earlier this year, Shreveport was one of 17 cities selected to receive a Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant. Ms. Brown was the principal author for the City's grant application. She has worked extensively with key leadership in the City to devise a strategy to address concentrated poverty in the distressed neighborhoods of Allendale/Ledbetter Heights through a holistic, place-based approach to neighborhood revitalization. With the recent selection by HUD as a designated Choice Neighborhood site, the planning team will finally be able to make tangible strides toward developing and achieving that vision. Ms. Brown's dissertation proposal seeks to provide a value-added component to this Choice Neighborhood planning effort. Her research will focus on ensuring neighborhood residents are engaged in the process in a meaningful and previously unstudied way. Her work will enhance Shreveport's capacity to successfully implement a Choice Neighborhood in the near future, and add to HUD's insight on the strategies to achieving an effective planning process.

This research is important to the applicant for another reason. From 2004-2007, Ms. Brown served as the Director of the LightHouse program for Volunteers of America. The LightHouse

provides support for high-risk youth and their families in Allendale/Ledbetter Heights. The LightHouse community center where her office was located is in what is now the designated Choice Neighborhood. She embraced a focused philosophy in her role at the LightHouse: in order to make a meaningful and lasting difference in a child's life, one must consider what changes need to take place in a child's social ecological system. This small-scale philosophy mirrors the larger premise for the Choice approach to disbanding concentrated, generational poverty through a multi-faceted, sustainable, comprehensive community development model. Ms. Brown believes in the merit of the Choice model. She seeks to support this initiative through her dissertation research so that she may contribute to the understanding of how communities can best plan to empower people toward creating and consuming pathways out of poverty.

Ms. Brown has demonstrated her commitment to civic involvement through participation in the Greater Shreveport Leadership Program (2005), was selected by the Community Foundation of Northwest Louisiana as a Community Catalyst (2006), and in 2007, the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce recognized her as one of the top 40 Under 40 professionals. With her extensive educational background, her relevant training and professional experience, her connection and history with the community targeted for research, and her desire to contribute to the early understanding of HUD's Choice Neighborhood planning efforts, Ms. Brown has demonstrated she has the capacity and motivation to successfully conduct the research planned in this proposal.

c. In order to prepare for her dissertation research plan and topic selection, Ms. Brown conducted a literature review to gain an understanding of previous efforts to study planning and resident engagement related to social capital, housing policy and neighborhood revitalization. Additionally, she communicated with stakeholders in Shreveport's Choice planning project, to gain insight as to what would be considered a highly valuable contribution to this effort. These

communications included contact with the City's Community Development office, the Planning Coordinator for Shreveport's Choice, and contacts at regional and federal levels of HUD who are invested in this project. These conversations, along with the review of the literature, comprised the foundation that guided the formation of the research questions proposed in this application.

2. Rating Factor 2: *Need for the Research*

a. This dissertation research is directly aligned with HUD's mission and 2010-2015 Strategic Plan and Goals to Create Strong, Sustainable, Inclusive Communities and Quality Affordable Homes for All. Choice Neighborhoods' novel approach to neighborhood revitalization focuses on comprehensive community planning, with an emphasis on resident participation, in order to successfully transform impoverished neighborhoods into neighborhoods of choice and opportunity. This approach envisions empowering residents to overcome the hopelessness of poverty by providing accessibility to community assets and resources. (Evidence Matters, 2011).

Research has shown that residential involvement is an essential key to success in launching a maintainable neighborhood revitalization initiative, and, therefore, residential engagement should be an integral part of the early stages of planning formulation (Evidence Matters, 2011). Social capital has been found to be significantly related to neighborhood capacity for change and perceptions of well-being for residents (Usher, 2007), and understanding how to engage residents in a meaningful way is critical to neighborhood revitalization success and sustainability. There is a gap in the literature in understanding the relationship between neighborhood revitalization, resident engagement and social capital. As the Choice planning process emphasizes meaningful resident engagement, it is important to understand how this engagement is meaningful to residents, specifically whether it impacts residents' social capital, and therefore capacity for change. In addition, we know little about creating a disciplined, simple process for building

social capital. The Shreveport Choice Neighborhood project will evaluate some approaches to building these connections, and use them in their resident engagement activities.

The Choice concept relies on the interest of persons outside of the neighborhood to invest in commercial ventures in and around the community. In addition, residents must see the revitalized neighborhood as a desirable place to live for themselves and their families. These two factors – outside investors and engaged, committed residents – can generate the in-fill development and mixed-income economy that a balanced, sustainable neighborhood requires (Morrison, 2011). Increasing the desirability of the neighborhood, perceptions of quality of life, and ultimately its market economy requires first an understanding and strengthening of a neighborhood's civic economy – its social capital, level of resident engagement, and perceptions of well-being and trust (Morrison, 2011). A vibrant civic economy is an integral foundation for a Choice Neighborhood. An environment of trust is an essential element to fostering a prosperous community, and trust is a key factor in establishing social capital (Usher, 2007). Although the individual components of social capital and social networks have been studied in depth, to date, limited research exists to understand how social capital and systems of social trust within low-income communities impact residents' openness to neighborhood revitalization efforts.

b. This research is important because it contributes to the knowledge base of community organizers and urban planners in their ability to meaningfully engage and empower citizens in community transformation initiatives. A greater understanding of the perceived civic economy and social trust systems of residents in blighted neighborhoods will assist planners and organizers in developing strategies to address revitalization efforts in significant and sustainable ways. This research will provide a foundation for pursuing strategic actions to foster a thriving civic economy. This research will examine the impact of the Choice planning process on

dimensions of social capital. This research will primarily inform the strategic planning efforts for the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights Choice Neighborhood; however, the broader impact will be its contribution to a greater understanding of the influence of resident engagement in the planning process on social capital. This research will provide useful insight to urban planners, social workers, sociologists, educators, and a broad variety of researchers and practitioners in a range of disciplines for future neighborhood revitalization planning purposes.

c. This research is responsive to HUD's Strategic Goals, as its outcomes will potentially impact future federal problem solving and policymaking in regards to neighborhood revitalization and residential engagement in the planning process. Specifically, this research will yield knowledge that will inform Goals 3 and 4, to Utilize Housing as a Platform for Improving the Quality of Life and to Build Inclusive and Sustainable Communities Free from Discrimination. Understanding the potential impact of resident engagement in revitalization planning on social capital, HUD partners will recognize how to plan for improving the quality of life for residents, and how to build sustainable and inclusive communities, through building local capacity.

3. Rating Factor 3: *Soundness of Approach*

a. Recognizing the need to understand the relationship between a neighborhood revitalization planning process, resident engagement and social capital, and the impact of those relationships on residents' readiness for the transformation of their community into a neighborhood of Choice, the following research questions were designed:

- *What are the residents' perceptions of systems of social trust that currently exist in the Allendale/Ledbetter Heights neighborhoods?*
- *Do dimensions of social capital and perceptions of social trust vary among different groups of people, such as gender, marital status, race/ethnicity, age group, educational level,*

employment status, homeowner status, and length of time living in the neighborhood?

- *Are residents' perceptions of trust related to their level of openness to the transformation of their neighborhood into a Choice Neighborhood?*
- *Are residents who perceive that they have access to health care, education and/or housing opportunities more inclined to believe that they can contribute to improve their civic economy?*
- *How does the Choice Neighborhood planning process impact the dimensions of social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights residents?*
- *Do different experiences of civic engagement and collaboration result in higher levels of trust, more extensive social networks, and more reliable reciprocal relationships?*

To explore these research questions, the design incorporates a pre-measurement post-measurement, mixed method, correlational study design, utilizing within-group analyses to examine variations among resident perceptions in relation to resident characteristics. At the start of the project, the design will incorporate qualitative data methods, which will include a content analysis of the Allendale ONE needs and assets assessment (2007) in order to obtain baseline data on the levels of social capital, openness to transformation and perceptions of the civic economy. In the initial stages of data collection, and prior to survey development, two focus groups will be held with neighborhood residents to ascertain the residents' vision of what a Choice Neighborhood will look like, and to identify perceived assets and barriers to achieving that vision. The location of the focus groups has not yet been determined, but accessibility will be considered a key factor in selecting a location within the neighborhood. Participants will be recruited through word of mouth and fliers posted in civic centers, churches, convenience stores and housing facilities in the neighborhood. During these focus groups, the concepts of civic economy and dimensions of social capital will be discussed, current and ideal perceptions of the

civic economy and systems of social trust will be explored and operationalized by the residents, and openness and/or resistance to (and reasons therein) the Choice Neighborhood transformation initiative will be considered. Dialogue from the focus groups will be analyzed through qualitative inquiry, transcribed and coded, utilizing Atlas.ti and Nvivo9 qualitative data analysis software, in order to identify key themes and patterns. The analysis procedure will include the following steps: create a coding guide, analyze data, organize data, categorize responses, code responses, and interpret data. Themes from the focus groups of this research project will be compared with the themes identified from the Allendale ONE assessment, identifying patterns and differences.

The results of the qualitative analyses will be used to inform the development of the survey, which will be an adaptation of the Harvard Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey – Short Form (Saguaro Seminar, 2000). This survey will be used to ascertain dimensions of social capital, which include current levels of social and inter-racial trust, civic leadership and associational involvement, and perceptions of the civic economy and individual well-being, access to and utilization of elements of the civic economy, and openness to transformation of the neighborhood to a neighborhood of Choice. The use of a survey instrument is intended to get a representative picture of the community compared with the data produced from the focus groups.

The survey methodology will be two-tiered, employing telephone and personal interview approaches. The targeted number of total surveys completed is 380, and this sample size is based on the goal of achieving a precision level of ±5%, at a confidence level of 95% where $p \leq .05$, for a population of 7000 (Israel, 2009). In order to ensure this sample size is achieved, the applicant will engage local community leadership (churches, non-profits, civic organizations) in the promotion of the survey, asking leadership to encourage neighborhood residents to participate in the survey if they are selected. The telephone survey will utilize random digit dialing for head of

households of the targeted neighborhoods of Allendale and Ledbetter Heights. Ms. Brown will work with LSU-Shreveport's Institute for Human Services and Public Policy to conduct the telephone survey, as IHSPP has experience, capacity, statistical software and student support to successfully carry out this survey method. The current combined population of Allendale/ Ledbetter Heights is approximately 7,000, and the target number of completed telephone surveys is 230, as a minimum of 100 completed surveys is generally regarded as the minimum for achieving adequate statistical power for analysis, and fewer completed surveys are necessary for a relatively demographically homogenous population (Andranovich & Howell, 2005). Of the 7000 residents in Allendale/Ledbetter Heights, 49.3% are living in poverty, 95.3% are minority (94.2% Black), and only 9% have obtained an associate's degree or higher (Census, 2000). Because of the markedly high rates of low educational attainment, the telephone survey approach is being used rather than a mass mailing, to circumvent potential literacy issues.

Following the telephone survey, a face-to-face household survey approach will be employed. This approach will utilize a random, multi-stage cluster sampling of the target population, and will target 150 households. The rationale for utilizing this additional approach is based on the elevated rates of poverty existing in the community, and the concern that many households may not subscribe to telephone service. It is anticipated that this additional measure of surveying will yield a more representative sample of resident responses. The applicant will employ the assistance of two students from LSUS to assist with the face-to-face household surveys.

The initial set of focus groups, telephone and face-to-face surveys will comprise the pre-measurement to answering the proposed research questions. Following this process, the applied policy intervention – Choice Neighborhood planning activities geared toward resident engagement – will be fully initiated by the Shreveport Choice Neighborhood Planning Team.

These activities will include collaborative action planning, the establishment of a Neighborhood Transformation Steering Committee comprised of residents, public meetings, surveying, interviewing, focus groups, public strategic doing sessions, design charettes, and citizen-led action plans for the Choice Neighborhood implementation design. According to the Planning Team's timeline, the bulk of these program activities are anticipated to be completed by the end of the first of this two year planning process, which will be May of 2012.

The post-measurement will take place beginning in May of 2012, and the research activities will replicate the design utilized in the pre-measurement. This will include two follow-up focus groups, and replications of the telephone and face-to-face household level surveys. This strategy will be utilized to ascertain the impact the Choice Neighborhood planning process had on the perceptions of social capital, the civic economy, and the openness to neighborhood transformation. Quantitative analysis of the surveys will consist of nonparametric methods, including descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Correlational studies (Chi-square, Pearson's *r*) will be utilized to determine the relationships between the research variables, the predictive qualities of those relationships, and correlational coefficients will identify the strengths of those relationships. A t-test for dependent samples will be used to measure the differences in perceived social capital between the pre and post measurements. Multivariate statistical methods (MANOVA, multiple regression) will be used to examine relationships among independent variables (for example, age, gender, residential status) and dependent variables (dimensions of social capital).

This research proposal has been carefully designed in order to respond most appropriately to the target population's capacity for participation through the use of appropriate methodology, in order to obtain the data and information that will most effectively answer the proposed research

questions. Numerous quality assurance mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the successful execution of this research plan, and further plans are being developed to consider alternatives to securing the necessary data, should barriers to implementation of the research plan arise, in order to ensure the validity and quality of the results.

One potential obstacle for this research design is obtaining an adequate response rate to the survey. Although the face-to-face survey method intends to provide quality assurance for addressing the potential for a low telephone response rate, if an inadequate response rate to both is an issue, a snowball sampling strategy using community centers, churches, and other places where people are likely to gather will be employed. LSU's policies do not allow funds to be used for incentives to research participants, and the applicant is exploring options for applying for funding for incentives through local foundations that could be filtered through directly to research participants. Incentives, if secured, will be an additional measure to ensuring an adequate response rate is achieved. Another potential concern is the ambitious timeline for the research, particularly in the 1st quarter of activities. Ms. Brown will be able to manage this approach through the cooperation of LSUS and the Choice Neighborhood Planning Team, particularly the Lead Planning Coordinator, Kim Mitchell. The high degree of institutional support Ms. Brown is being provided is another key factor which will ensure her ability to actionably achieve the project milestones within the timeframe planned. For example, LSU will provide the support of student workers for data entry, and an office that is located on the same floor of the building where her Committee members are housed, who will be able to provide timely feedback and guidance for problem-solving.

c. Strategies for dissemination of the research are woven throughout the project timeline. Ms. Brown will present this research at numerous professional and academic conferences, and will pursue publishing in peer-reviewed journals and other types of media. She will share her dissertation with LSU, LSUS, and the Shreveport Choice Planning Team, who will post it on websites and make available to stakeholders. She will target a relevant audience of researchers, policymakers and practitioners in state and local conferences and meetings. Most importantly, she will host a series of sessions in community centers in Allendale/Ledbetter Heights, sharing findings with residents, and to highlight the importance of the study and their contribution.

d. This research is consistent with HUD's Strategic Plan and will assist HUD in achieving its strategic goal by contributing to the following Policy Priority: Capacity Building and Knowledge Sharing. This research will directly impact the planning and implementation efforts of Shreveport's Choice Neighborhood initiative, and will promote knowledge sharing among relevant networks. The impact will be important for the field of social work, and related fields as well, as it will help inform community organizers, planners, administrators, government officials, and others of the importance and relevance of the development of the civic economy as a foundation for improving housing and quality of life opportunities for persons in need.

ACTIVITIES	MEASURES OF SUCCESS
1) Implementation of research dissemination plan	Publishing of dissertation through websites and at least 1 article in a peer-reviewed journal
2) Integration of research findings with practitioners in the field of study	Development of strategy to build social capital for Allendale/Ledbetter Heights
3) Presentation of research at academic/professional conferences	Presentation at 2 or more academic and/or professional conferences

e. See Attachment VI, support letter from the School of Social Work at LSU, which details and outlines the specific types of support and resources the institution will provide to support Ms. Brown's research, which is additional to what is normally provided to PhD students.

VITA

Mary Ellen Brown, originally of Shreveport, Louisiana, is currently a resident of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. She received her bachelor's degree from Spring Hill College in 2000, her master's in social work degree from the University of South Carolina in 2004, her master's of public administration degree from Louisiana State University in 2011, and has been a licensed clinical social worker since 2010. Prior to entering her doctoral studies, she served as the director of the LightHouse program for Volunteers of America of North Louisiana, and later as the Executive Director for the Institute for Human Services and Public Policy at Louisiana State University in Shreveport. Over the past four years she has worked in the Office of Social Service Research and Development at Louisiana State University, most recently in the position of a senior research associate. She has been the primary author for two successful Choice Neighborhood planning grants and one Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation initiative implementation grant for the cities of Baton Rouge and Shreveport, Louisiana, and has served on the core leadership team and as a researcher for each of these initiatives since 2011. She will receive her doctorate in August 2015, and she will join the faculty at Arizona State University as an assistant professor, also in August 2015.